NUNC COGNOSCO EX PARTE

TRENT UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

To the Rev. T. E. O'Loughlin
with compliments
M. O'R

CATHOLICITY AND PROGRESS IN IRELAND

BY

REV. M. O'RIORDAN, D.Ph., D.D., D.C.L.

"If a man will make courtesy and say nothing, he is virtuous."
—SHAKESPEARE (Henry IV.)

Tempus tacendi et tempus loquendi.

LONDON:
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO., LTD.,
DRYDEN HOUSE, GERRARD STREET, W.

ST. LOUIS, MO.
B. HERDER.

1905

BX 1505 .O7 1905

PRINTED BY CAHILL & CO., DUBLIN.

DIVO

AQUINATI ET SALESIO

DICATUM

126284

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

https://archive.org/details/catholicityprogr0000orio

PREFACE.

The following pages have been arranged from a series of criticisms which have appeared during the past year on questions raised by Sir Horace Plunkett in his book, "Ireland in the New Century":—But whilst his book has been the occasion of them, their scope is more general. As readers will at once observe, passages are quoted from it, and merely used as texts for the general discussion of those questions which he has raised. Sir Horace represents a certain phase of thought; and I have taken him to be as sincere in his criticism as I believe him to be earnest in his work. Several books have recently been published for the purpose of pointing out that things are very wrong with Catholics in general, but most of all with the Catholics of Ireland. These compilations are however privileged, at any rate as far as I am concerned. To touch them would be to touch pitch. But Sir Horace lives on a higher plane, and thinks in another sphere. Moreover, he has given proof that he is in earnest by the work which he has done, and is doing, for his country. Those others are not known to have ever done much that is useful for anybody, some of them have succeeded in doing but little for themselves.

In an Epilogue which he has added to a Popular Edition of his book he thus refers to the contents of the following pages:—"I have not a word to say against its tone, but the writer frequently reads into my words propositions which I certainly never intended to advance." I think it right to place in this Preface his own testimony that I have tried to treat him fairly. Whether I

have mistaken his meaning, or have drawn just and natural inferences from his words, belongs neither to him nor to me to judge, but to the public for whom I have written. I have quoted the context from his book in each case, and the reader can judge for himself. Although the Epilogue in the New Edition of his book has been specially added as a rejoinder to critics, he disposes of the contents of the following pages in the few words I have just quoted. He does not name those particulars in which he says I have misunderstood his meaning. But he adds these few words as his reason for not doing more:—"Moreover, a review is usually a chapter about a book, but when, as in this case, it assumes the proportions of a book about a chapter, such space as I could afford to devote to a rejoinder would appear disrespectfully small."

It is true that the following pages are devoted chiefly, but not exclusively, to the contents of one chapter of his book; which only calls to mind the well known truth, that an accusation can be made in one short sentence the damaging consequences of which might take a whole book to thoroughly undo. If the purpose of the following pages were mere controversy rather than right criticism, dialectical triumph rather than the discovery of truth, nothing should please me more than that he had disposed of what I have written in those few lines of his Epilogue. For, notwithstanding the shortcomings of this book which I now submit to the public, I do not think that those who read it dispassionately will agree with Sir Horace that he has met the case by merely avoiding an appearance of disrespect for the writer.

It is true that a chapter in his book has been mostly the occasion of this volume; and the best lesson for him to read in the fact would be one to which several friends have directed his attention, namely, the mistake

of ever having made that chapter a part of his book. The chapter was not at all necessary; in strictness it was even irrelevant. Without it, his book would have usefully instructed the public in the propædeutics of the economic enterprise which he has undertaken; with it, he has alienated or cooled the enthusiasm of some cordial helpers, raised suspicions in many who most trusted him, and has turned the tongues of some who never welcomed his work towards his own economic shortcomings, directing public attention, prematurely as I think, but still with destructive effect, towards the fruitless financial arrangements of the Department which he controls.

He writes in his Epilogue:—"I have placed my countrymen neither in the dock, on a pedestal, or on the stage. My offence is more grave—I have criticised them;" * and: "As I took some national shortcomings for my theme, it was inevitable that the greater the truth of what I wrote the more bitterly should I be condemned by those who mould popular opinion in Ireland." † Now, the quarrel which Catholics have with him is not over the economic drawbacks of their country. They are quite conscious of these—more painfully conscious than others, since they are affected more intimately. Their quarrel with him is over the *causes* to which he traces those drawbacks. Had he taken the country as it stands, pointed out its wants, and simply set about helping to improve the condition of things, Catholics would no more quarrel with him for pointing out the disease than for trying to cure it. As a matter of fact, which indeed he spontaneously acknowledged in his book, his earliest encouragement came from them, and the most zealous of his unpaid supporters have been priests. But he *would* be an etiologist also; he *would* point to their Catholic faith as one

* Page 295. † Page 297.

of the great sources of their economic shortcomings. Even though their Catholic principles or practices were chiefly or largely the cause, reminding them of it could not help his project for their improvement unless they consented to have that alleged obstacle removed by casting away their faith, or by twisting its principles till they fitted into his. He intruded *religious causes* into the question, and told them that their want of industrial success is largely due to their Catholic faith. That is the cause of the quarrel; and in his Epilogue he upbraids them for complaining. No Catholic has denied his right to criticise them; but they in their turn reply, and he resents it. He seems to have expected that he might criticise with impunity; which implies *his right* of criticism, and *their duty* of silence. Non-Catholics in Ireland have been so long the sportsmen and Catholics so long the targets, that those who have had a monopoly in criticism as in almost everything else, are surprised to discover marksmen standing where only targets used to be. That circumstance possibly accounts for his complaining in the Epilogue of "censors who combine a total disregard for the feelings of others with a morbid sensitiveness for their own,"(3) whilst he himself could write in his book:—"*And without doubt a good many motives which have but a remote connection with religion are, unfortunately, at work in the Church-building movement.*"(4) It is due to him to note that he has removed this sentence from the New Edition; but he has let it disappear from the page without record or apology in the Epilogue.

What I have written as an Introductory Chapter was begun within an hour after the thought of writing first occurred to me, with the intention of completing in a few articles what I was to write But the field opened before me as I went on, and now I find myself letting

* Page 299. † First Edition, page 107.

a book go before the public which was far from my thoughts much less than a twelvemonth ago. Hardly a dozen pages of it have been written in the daytime; most of it has been done hurriedly, and during hours taken from sleep. I do not offer that circumstance as an apology, but as an explanation of its defects.

After having, in Chapter II., discussed the charge made against Catholics in Ireland, of extravagance in church-building, I pass on to consider whether the social influence of the Catholic faith is responsible, to the large extent alleged, for their present economic condition, or whether that condition can be fully accounted for by other causes. With that view I first discuss the meaning of human progress; the relation of Catholic teaching to it; then the application of that teaching as illustrated in certain Catholic nations, and the application of other teachings in other countries. I next proceed to account for the exceptional case of Catholic Ireland; and in order to make my position clear I begin by discussing the meaning of what Sir Horace Plunkett calls "character and *morale*." Then through several chapters I discuss the legislative and economic factors which have left the Catholics of Ireland in the condition in which they find themselves to-day. I next pass on to inquire into the relation of the priests to the social, political, and industrial interests of the people, and their influence on each. Having done all that, I thought I had established my right, and I think it was my duty to turn back and ask what have the Government, the Landlords, and the Protestant Church got from the country, and what has each done in return for its social and industrial good? In the next place, I discuss the charges made against Convents and their relation to the temporal concerns of the people. Finally, I review the history of education in Ireland; the object of which is to show how grievously Sir Horace

CHAPTER V.

PAGE

SOCIAL ECONOMICS IN BELGIUM 97

Some reflections on mere industrialism and naturalism—Belgian statistics as to population and industry—Illustrations in social economics—Catholic social leaders—Witnesses giving evidence—Some adverse evidence cross-examined—The Industrial Revival in Spain—More witnesses called.

CHAPTER VI.

THE CHARACTER OF IRISH CATHOLICS 122

The meaning of character discussed—Should not be claimed exclusively for the industrial spirit—Shown in passivity as well as in activity—Those principles applied to the case of Irish Catholics—Their "character and *morale*" proved at home and in exile—Witnesses give evidence.

CHAPTER VII.

IRISH CATHOLIC INDUSTRY 134

The cause of its drawbacks not to be found in the Catholic faith of the people, but in adverse legislation and in non-Catholic monopoly—The fate of various industries recorded, and traced to causes—Acts of Parliament are quoted, and witnesses give evidence—Industrial success of Catholics at every opportunity, and in spite of disabilities—The smuggling trade—More witnesses called.

CHAPTER VIII.

IRISH CATHOLIC INDUSTRY—AGRICULTURE 154

Irish Catholics reduced to the condition of cottiers on their own lands—Pastures extended, and agriculture neglected—Froude on the new gentry in Ireland—Legal and economic obstacles to agricultural industry on the part of Irish Catholics—Tithes; rack-rents; want of tenure—Bishop Berkeley's *Exhortation to the Roman Catholic Clergy.*

CHAPTER IX.

HOW OUR "SUPERIORS" HAVE TRAINED US TO INDUSTRIAL HABITS BY WORD AND EXAMPLE 167

Lecky, his impartiality and partiality—Some reflections on his philosophy of history—Methods of educating the Irish

PAGE

Catholics in the 18th century—The Charter Schools—What Howard, the Philanthropist, thought of them—Lecky on the Irish country gentry.

CHAPTER X.

IRISH CATHOLIC MERCHANT INDUSTRY: IRISH INDUSTRY UNDER A HOME AND UNDER A FOREIGN PARLIAMENT 179

The difficulties under which Irish Catholics lived—Effects of the Penal Laws—Industrial success of Catholic merchants, their disabilities notwithstanding—Evidence of witnesses—The Free Trade Movement—Industrial Ireland under Grattan's Parliament, and afterwards: a contrast—Evidence of witnesses; statistics—The people thrown back again upon the land—Tenants-at-will—The Encumbered Estates Act; What it revealed, and what followed it—Pictures true to life drawn by Aubrey de Vere and by Canon Sheehan.

CHAPTER XI.

THE ACTION OF THE IRISH PRIESTS IN THE TEMPORAL CONCERNS OF THE PEOPLE 199

The official duty of priests neither political nor industrial—The Irish priest in the political arena, and what drove him there—The Irish priest in the Industrial Movement—Illustrations taken from industries inaugurated and worked by priests.

CHAPTER XII.

THE "CIVIC VIRTUES" OF THE NORTH CONSIDERED 231

The South led the way in the Co-operative Movement—How Belfast rose, and Ulster prospered—The Ulster Custom—*The Protestant Colonization Society*: *The Protestant Tenantry Society*—Witnesses give evidence—The failure of Scotch farmers in Ireland—The prosperity of Ulster tested—Evidence of witnesses—Religious volcanic eruptions.

CHAPTER XIII.

CATHOLIC AND NON-CATHOLIC SUPERSTITION 247

Illustrations of Non-Catholic Superstitions, Protestant and Rationalist—What superstition is, and what it is not—The Catholic position misunderstood and misrepresented—A crone's criticism on the author of "*Father Clancy*."

CHAPTER XIV.

PAGE

Loss of Faith Abroad; Intemperance at Home 259

"The Leakage" in England—"Converts" to Protestantism in Ireland, in the famine times and since—Intemperance amongst the Catholics of Ireland: to what extent it is true: The people at large not the only nor the greatest culprits—The action of the priests against intemperance—The Anti-Treating League, its use and its limits—Sir Horace Plunkett's plan of killing intemperance by philosophy: a Captain Bobadil method, ever ancient and always easy

CHAPTER XV.

How the Priests Cause Emigration 271

The chastity of Irish Catholics considered as a cause of lunacy and emigration—The priests instructed in their duty—Sir Horace Plunkett learns the mind and ways of the people from Sunday cyclists—The true causes of emigration suggested and discussed.

CHAPTER XVI.

What the Government and its Garrison in Ireland have given the People in Return for what they have got ... 294

The position of the priests in relation to the economic interests of the people—The financial relations between England and Ireland at the Union—What it cost to carry the Union, and how the sums were spent—What it has cost to maintain the Union—What Ireland has given the Government and what is given in return—The sums sent as rent from Ireland to absentee landlords—The savings of tenants notwithstanding—How thrift in their condition did them more harm than good—Rack-rents; eviction; emigration—Evidence of *The Times* and other witnesses—Trinity College, landlord and educationist.

CHAPTER XVII.

What the Protestant Church has got in Ireland, and what it has done in Return 311

The Tithes and the Tithe War—Tithes appearing under various phases—The Resources of the "Church of Ireland" enormous and various; Tithes; lands; Government grants, etc.—How it has been equipped for its mission in Ireland;

PAGE

the results—"Charity begins at home" illustrated—Witnesses give evidence—What the Irish nation meant to Chief Justice Whiteside, and those whom he represented: *L'Irelande; c'est moi.*

CHAPTER XVIII.

LESSONS IN TOLERANCE AND IN INTOLERANCE 342

A new notion of tolerance—Catholic and Non-Catholic Tolerance illustrated by facts.

CHAPTER XIX.

RELIGIOUS CORPORATIONS IN IRELAND: THEIR COST AND THEIR WORK 354

Ideas of the Religious State spun out on the spider system—The *rationale* of Catholic institutions and practices misunderstood—Civil rights claimed for Catholic men and women independently of the approval of outsiders—Sir Horace's economic division of the "productive" and the "unproductive" classes discussed—Religious communities, the contemplative and active.

CHAPTER XX.

THE CRITICS OF CONVENTS CRITICISED; NUNS, THEIR CIVIL RIGHTS AND THEIR WORK 375

Catholic ladies do not lose their civil rights to be teachers or nurses by joining a religious community—The inconsistencies of their critics—The position of nuns engaged in works of a private character—Convent teaching considered in its shortcomings and its benefits.

CHAPTER XXI.

NUNS AS TEACHERS AND NURSES 382

Nuns engaged in works of a public character—Mr. F. H. Dale's official testimony to the excellence of Nuns as Teachers in the Irish National Schools—Some statistics in confirmation—Evidence of the efficiency of Nuns as hospital nurses—Reply to objections against Nuns as teachers and nurses—Nuns taught the poor in Ireland when all others disowned the duty or shirked the work—The statement illustrated—As Teachers in the National Schools and as Nurses in the Workhouse Hospitals, their work a gain to

PAGE

the public in efficiency, and a saving in expeuse—Sir Horace Plunkett's mistake in thinking that the Conventual Establishments of the country have been raised at the expense of the public—The finances of the Convents in the diocese of Limerick exposed in illustration, and taken as a type for the country in general.

CHAPTER XXII.

NUNS AND TECHNICAL TRAINING... 405

What Nuns are doing for industrial work in Ireland—The subject illustrated by facts.

CHAPTER XXIII.

A REVIEW OF EDUCATION IN IRELAND. 420

Evolution of the design to educate Catholics out of their faith and patriotism—The Parish School System; The Diocesan Free Schools; The Royal Schools of the London Companies; The Erasmus Smith Schools; Bluecoat Hospital Free Schools; Foundling Hospital Schools; The Charter Schools; The Hibernian Military and Marine Schools; "The Association for Discountenancing Vice and Promoting the Knowledge and the Practice of the Christian Religion"; "The Irish Society for Promoting the Education of the Native Irish through the medium of their own Language"; The Kildare Street Society Schools—The National System; The functions of the Managers under the System; Its Training Colleges; What Priests have done for popular Education in Ireland—The rise of Catholic Colleges in Ireland: The Model Schools designed to supersede them; the failure of these to hold their own against Catholic Primary Schools—The Intermediate System; Catholic Colleges win prestige under it—University Education; The Royal University; Catholic Colleges leave the Queen's Colleges behind in the race—Trinity College; its wealth; its failure as an Educational Institution shown by facts; its hollow prestige—The Catholic University: its aim and work—The work of the Catholic University of Louvain an illustration of what a Catholic University can do—The failure of those who have undertaken to educate us a reason for letting us educate ourselves.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTION.

Sir Horace Plunkett's "Ireland in the New Century," is an instructive book. Yet, I am doubtful whether it will further or hinder the good work which the author has been doing for Ireland. Speaking generally, I think it is unwise for anyone who holds a public administrative position to publish a book on his own office. That he is sincere and means well, the work he has been doing for some years past is the best evidence. Moreover, strange as it may appear, those things in his book from which I most differ give me strong testimony to his honesty if not to his prudence. He has given expression to some thoughts as to the influence of Catholicism on economics and national character in general, and of Irish Catholicism on the welfare of Ireland in particular which might have been left out without leaving the book incomplete, and which may create prejudice against himself and his motives in those quarters where he most needs sympathy and co-operation for the economic work with which he is identified. Many who will not read his book will pass judgment on it; but it will be an impression of it and of its author made by the criticisms of it which they read, with the possible result that some who might be ready to help may now keep away—if not in opposition, at least in neutrality. I think that would be a great pity, and the criticism which I propose to make on some points he has raised is not intended to create prejudice against him or his work, but merely to point out some errors into which I think he has fallen.

I am a Catholic—I hope an intelligent one. I do not pretend to be non-political. Those who say they have no politics are almost always the keenest of political partisans. No person who regards the duties of citizenship can be non-political. What some persons mean when they declare themselves non-political is that they are opposed to the popular politics of the hour; that is, they want to let things stay *in statu quo*, even though grievances exist, and though many suffer hardships for the advantage of a few. Those who, a quarter of a century ago, affected a dislike of politics, were those who preferred political passivity which would let things be as they were, to any political activity which made for a change in the order of things that was, and threatened existing political privileges with the gradual growth of political justice which we have been witnessing in recent years. I call that politics of the deepest tinge, partisan politics, moreover. Whilst I profess political leanings, I think I am less given to partisan politics than they. I have never stood on a political platform, have never belonged to a political association, have never made a political speech, or written a political letter to a newspaper. Thus, I hope that what I am about to write will more reveal the spirit of truth than the spirit of party. Sir Horace avows himself a Protestant and a Unionist, and one cannot expect him to look at Nationalism or Catholicism from a Nationalist or Catholic point of view. To suppose that he should see either or both as Catholics and Nationalists see them, would imply that a man of his earnestness is insincere in remaining as he is. He naturally looks at them through the coloured glasses of a Unionist and a Protestant. But he has formed his judgment, as he tells us, from observation and practical experience, and he is satisfied that he has found the truth. But, further experience and observation to-

morrow may correct and discredit his conclusions of to-day.

I propose to consider chiefly those points which he has raised with regard to the responsibility of the Catholic Church in Ireland for the position in which we Irish find ourselves at the opening of the twentieth century. As to the relation of his economic revival with the political movement, I do not see why they cannot work in harmony. Mere politics and Parliamentary work will not save the country. They can not build up its prosperity; they can at best only give the people the power to build it up. On the other hand, in no country more than in Ireland is economic work more in need of Parliamentary work. To take one case. Let us suppose that we had achieved the result of having every town in Ireland blessed with some manufacture. The cost of production is not all counted till the goods are exposed for sale at the market. Hence, the expense of taking the goods to market has to be calculated as part of the cost of production. Our markets are in England. Hence we must count the cost of transit from, let us say, Ballinasloe to Liverpool. Now everybody knows the extravagant cost of transit through Ireland; and, consequently, the question of transit will have to be faced and settled before economic Ireland can be in a position of fair play to compete with foreigners in the market. But the only economic Ireland which the Railway Companies know of is that element in Ireland which brings them dividends. They will never make a sacrifice of dividends for the sake of the public good, and they do not seem to have breadth of vision enough to see that, by lessening the cost of transit, they would gain in the long run by increase of traffic, just as the penny postage increased the Imperial Revenue. That Irish grievance must be redressed by political action, for only Parliament can make the Irish

Railway Companies behave themselves with some regard for those on whose patronage they have to depend for profit.

Lest the criticisms which I propose to make on his book should in any way help to create prejudice against him, I have thought that I ought in justice to quote the following points which he places to the credit of the Catholic Church in reckoning its influence on Irish National progress. What follows are the words of Sir Horace, which I let speak for themselves:—

"I now come to the second great influence upon the thought and action of the Irish people, the influence of religion, especially the power exercised by the priests and by the unrivalled organization of the Roman Catholic Church*. . . . . I am, of course, here concerned with only those aspects of the religious situation which bear directly on secular life. I am endeavouring, it must be remembered, to arrive at a comprehensive and accurate appreciation of the chief influences which mould the character, guide the thought, and therefore direct the action of the Irish people as citizens of this world and of their own country†. . .

"It is true that we cannot expect of any church or religion, as a condition of its acceptance, that it will furnish an economic theory; and it is also true that Roman Catholicism has, at different periods of history, advantageously affected economic conditions, even if it did not act from distinctly economic motives—for example by its direct influence on the suppression of slavery, and its creation of the mediæval craft guilds. It may, too, be admitted that during the Middle Ages, when Roman Catholicism was freer than now to manifest its influence in many directions, owing to its practically unchallenged supremacy, it favoured, when it did not originate, many forms of sound economic activity,

* Page 94. † Page 97.

and was, to say the least, abreast of the time in its conception of the working of economic causes. But from the time when the Reformation, by its demand for what we Protestants conceive to be a simpler Christianity, drove Roman Catholicism back, if I may use the expression, on its first line of defence, and constrained it to look to its distinctively spiritual heritage, down to the present day, it has seemed to stand strangely aloof from any contact with industrial and economic issues."* . . . . . "What I have just been saying with regard to Roman Catholicism generally, in relation to economic doctrines and industrial progress, applies, of course, with a hundred-fold pertinence to the case of Ireland. Between the enactment of the Penal Laws and the date of Roman Catholic Emancipation, Irish Roman Catholics were, to put it mildly, afforded scant opportunity, in their own country, of developing economic virtues or achieving industrial success. Ruthlessly deprived of Education, are they to be blamed if they did not use the newly acquired facilities to the best advantage? With their religion looked on as the badge of legal and social inferiority, was it any wonder that priests and people alike, whilst clinging with unexampled fidelity to their creed, remained altogether cut off from the current of material prosperity? Excluded, as they were, not merely from social and political privileges, but from the most ordinary civil rights, denied altogether the right of ownership of real property, and restricted in the possession of personality, is it any wonder that they are not to-day in the van of industrial and commercial progress? Nay, more, was it to have been expected that the character of a people so persecuted and ostracised should have come out of the ordeal of centuries with its adaptability and elasticity unimpaired? That would have been impossible. Those who are intimate with the Roman Catholic people of Ireland, and at the

* Pages 102 and 103.

same time familiar with their history, will recognise in their character and mental outlook many an instance of that epoch of serfdom. I speak, of course, of the mass, for I am not unmindful of many exceptions to this generalisation"*

". . . . What I may call the secular shortcomings of the Roman Catholics in Ireland cannot be fairly judged except as the results of a series of enactments by which they were successively denied almost all means of succeeding as citizens of this world. From such study as I have been able to give to the history of their Church, I have come to the conclusion that the immense power of the Roman Catholic clergy has been singularly little abused. I think it must be admitted that they have not exhibited in any marked degree bigotry towards Protestants. They have not put obstacles in the way of the Roman Catholic majority choosing Protestants for political leaders, and it is significant that refugees, such as the Palatines, from Catholic persecutions in Europe, found at different times a home amongst the Roman Catholic people of Ireland. My own experience, too, if I may again refer to that, distinctly proves that it is no disadvantage to a man to be a Protestant in Irish political life, and that where oppression is shown to him by Roman Catholics, it is almost invariably on political, social, or agrarian, but not on religious grounds."†

. . . . "The evil, commonly described as 'The Priest in Politics' is, in my opinion, greatly misrepresented. The cases of priests who take an improper part in politics are cited without reference to the vastly greater number who take no part at all, except when genuinely assured that a definite moral issue is at stake, I also have in my mind the question of how we should have fared if the control of the different Irish agitations had been confined to laymen, and if the clergy had not

* Pages 104 and 105. † Page 106.

consistently condemned secret associations. But, whatever may be said in defence of the priest in politics in the past, there are the strongest grounds for deprecating a continuance of their political activity in the future. As I gauge the several forces now operating in Ireland, I am convinced that, if an anti-clerical movement similar to that which other Roman Catholic countries have witnessed, were to succeed in discrediting the priesthood and lowering them in public estimation, it would be followed by a moral, social, and political degradation, which would blight, or at least postpone, our hopes of a national regeneration. From this point of view I hold that those clergymen who are predominantly politicians endanger the moral influence which it is their solemn duty to uphold. I believe, however, that the overactive part hitherto taken in politics by the priests is largely the outcome of the way in which Roman Catholics were treated in the past, and that this undesirable feature in Irish life will yield, and is already yielding to the removal of the evils to which it owed its origin, and in some measure its justification.

"One has only to turn to the spirit and temper of such representative Roman Catholics as Archbishop Healy and Dr. Kelly, Bishop of Ross—to their words and to their deeds—in order to catch the inspiration of a new movement amongst our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen, at once religious and patriotic. And if my optimism ever wavers, I have but to think of the noble work that many priests are to my own knowledge doing, often in remote and obscure parishes, in the teeth of innumerable obstacles." . . . . "I may mention that of the co-operative societies organised by the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society there are no fewer than 331 societies of which the local priests are the chairmen, while, to my own knowledge, during the summer and autumn of 1902, as many as 50,000 persons

from all parts of Ireland were personally conducted over the exhibit of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction at the Cork Exhibitron by their local clergy. The educational purpose of those visits is explained in Chap. X. Again, in a great number of cases, the village libraries which have been recently started in Ireland with the assistance of the Department (the books consisting largely of industrial, economic, and technical works on agriculture) have been organised and assisted by the Roman Catholic clergy.''*

I shall consider other passages in the book in the light of those I have quoted.

* Pages 117-118-119.

CHAPTER II.

CATHOLIC CHURCH BUILDING IN IRELAND.

I.

Sir Horace Plunkett says*:—"A charge of another kind has of late been brought against the Roman Catholic Clergy, which has a direct bearing upon the economic aspect of this question. Although, as I have read Irish history, the Roman Catholic priesthood here, in the main, used their authority with personal disinterestedness, if not always with prudence and discretion, their undoubted zeal for religion has, on occasion, assumed forms which enlightened Roman Catholics, including high dignitaries of that Church, think unjustifiable on economic grounds, and discourage, even from a religious standpoint. Excessive and extravagant church-building in the heart and at the expense of poor communities is a recent and notorious example of this mis-directed zeal. It has, I believe, been too often forgotten that the best monument of any clergyman's influence and earnestness must always be found in the moral character and the spiritual fibre of his flock, and not in the marbles and mosaics of a gaudy edifice. And without doubt a good many motives, which have but a remote connection with religion, are, unfortunately, at work in the church-building movement. It may, however, be regarded to some extent as an extreme reaction from the penal times, when the hunted *Soggarth* had to celebrate the Mass in cabins and caves in the mountain side. . . . This expenditure, however, has been incurred, and no one, I take it, would advocate the

*At pages 106, 107 and 108.

demolition of existing religious edifices on the ground that their erection had been unduly costly; the moral is for the present and the future, and applies not merely to economy in new buildings, but also in the decoration of existing churches. . . . One of the unfortunate effects of this passion for building costly churches is the importation of quantities of foreign art-work, in the shape of wood-carvings, stained glass, mosaics, and metal-work. . . . These articles which have been actually imported, in the impulse to get everything finished as soon as possible, generally consist of stock pieces produced in a spirit of mere commercialism in the workshops of Continental firms, which make it their business to cater for a public who do not know the difference between good art and bad. Much of the decoration of ecclesiastical buildings, whether Roman Catholic or Protestant, might fittingly be postponed until religion in Ireland has got into closer relation with the native artistic sense and industrial spirit now beginning to seek creative expression."

He *has no doubt that other motives than religious have been at work in the church-building movement!* Now, the church-building movement with which he finds fault may afford a fair field for discussion; but he should have clearly seen that to go behind those actions in stone and discuss the motives which inspired them, is a very grave impropriety. What can we know of the motives which actuated those who have been building churchs over the country? He cannot see the meaning of those fine churches; he would not build them himself from a motive of divine worship; and so, projecting his own ideas into those who have built them, he cannot see how they have had religious motives either.

If any priests have had unworthy motives in building churches, that is a matter between them and God; and there would be neither reason nor religion in my

prying into them. Coming from an outsider it is an act of unbecomingness such as one would not expect from a person of Sir Horace Plunkett's character. It is possible that some have had unworthy motives; it is even possible that none of those who have been building churches in Ireland have been inspired by the higher motives. I do not know; and he has far less opportunity of knowing. Nevertheless, he say so; and even he has *no doubt* about it. The question applies almost exclusively to parish priests. Now, as a rule, a parish priest before he has an opportunity of settling about the building of a church is well in the decline of life; and by the time he has completed it, it is nearly time for him to sing his *Nunc Dimittis*. Very little margin, then, is left for the play of his ambition; but if in his old age he looks with complacency on the work he has done, it is the least pleasure we might allow him for the time and trouble and money and occasional misunderstanding it has cost him. He can hope to enjoy it but for a few years more; but his people will enjoy it, and their children after them. A parish priest builds a church not for himself but for his people. He takes all the trouble; he takes his share of the cost; and the people with their generations after them will enjoy the memorial of his labour when he is gone.

Again, is this "excessive and extravagant church-building" general, or only exceptional If this charge of excess refers only to exceptional cases, then, even though true, it is improper to complain of it. Such exceptional cases of errors and shortcomings take place in every department of life. If I had a mind to turn on the working of the Department which Sir Horace directs I think I could point out some particulars which would "shock the economic sense"—yes, even in that place where we are expected to believe that the genius of

economics reigns. But if those shortcomings are exceptional, few persons acquainted with practical life would think of making them a cause of public complaint or reproof. But he speaks as if the charge referred to an excess that is common. By whom, then, is the charge made? Who are those "High Church dignitaries" who make it? If they are bishops, they have the prevention as well as the cure in their own hands, since no priest may build a church without the sanction of his bishop. A bishop who complains of extravagant church-building in his own diocese thereby inculpates himself. If he blames that extravagance as happening in another diocese, I reserve my judgment till I hear what the bishop of that diocese has to say, for he must know the state of his own diocese better than any outsider, even though the critic be episcopal. Church dignitaries, as well as churchmen who are not dignitaries, may name a church here and there which in their opinion is too expensive. Yes, in their opinion; but not in the opinion of those who bore all the task of building them, nor of the bishops who let them do it. Who, then, are they who make the charge? The Protestants of Ireland? Why, it is in spite of Protestantism that we have a church at all. Is it the notorious compiler of the book called "Priests and People in Ireland," and such persons as retain the name of Catholic, whilst they scoff at articles of faith? But one must not expect much knowledge of Catholic principles from persons who have been brought up from childhood in Institutions where Catholic doctrines and principles are not taught? Is it the "Roman Catholic Farmer," whose conscience was so sorely tried by the unpriestly avarice and neglect of Canon McInerney, P.P., V.G., that he had to appeal to the *Irish Times* for a reformation in the ecclesiastical affairs of Killaloe? Is it the "Connaughtman," "Catholicus," the "Roman Catholic Barrister," and the other

nameless "Catholics" who caught the epidemic of slander which broke out in the office of the *Irish Times* and over-ran the country for several weeks? Canon McInerney has, by his evidence in Court, torn the mask from those "enlightened Catholics," and exposed them to public scorn; so that whenever such as the "Roman Catholic Farmer" appear again in the *Irish Times*, or elsewhere, we shall know them for the Pharisees and the forgers that they are.* It is well known now that the "Roman Catholic Farmer" is not a Catholic at all; and I presume that those other anonymous "Catholics" who unburdened their consciences in the *Irish Times* walk the same way of salvation.

This is a curious fact. One never hears a complaint of excess or extravagance from those who subscribe most to church-building and such objects. The complaint and criticism comes from those who never subscribe at all, or as rarely as they can, and as little as they can do with for very shame. It is so with that class in every department of life. If the Parliamentary Party ask them for a subscription they take no interest in politics, they think that economic Ireland is too much forsaken. If an industrial movement is started and they are asked to help, they have neither interest nor hope in the possibility of such movements until Home Rule comes. The truth is that they have neither economic, political, nor

* This refers to the action for libel brought by the Vicar General of Killaloe against the *Irish Times* on account of a letter published in it, which accused the Vicar of neglecting the poor of his parish, and of caring only for the rich, and for his revenues. Counsel for the *Irish Times* did not even cross-examine the Vicar on his evidence, but settled the case at once. The reader will have an insight into the character of those "Roman Catholic" correspondents from the fact that, although the "Roman Catholic Farmer" from Killaloe confided his name and address to the Editor of the *Irish Times*, a registered letter did not find him there when the Editor wanted his evidence to meet the action. Besides the financial element of the settlement, counsel for the *Irish Times* made a most unqualified apology in Court on every statement and suggestion in the letter.

religious principle. Their only principle is in their pocket—and their only interest also. It is a pity that Sir Horace Plunkett has published those expressions at a time when they will be interpreted not according to the spirit in which I believe he writes them, but in the shadow of the epidemic of slander against Irish Catholicism which has lately broken out in many quarters of the country.

II.

The sort of house which a people build to God depends on the nature and depth of their faith, and on the form of their worship. A people who did not believe in God at all would not, of course, think of building a church wherein to worship Him. It would be a work without meaning or merit. The positivist, whose "god" is Humanity, is satisfied with a hall. An agnostic needs only the earth and ocean with the dome of heaven above, to worship the Great Unknown, hidden behind boundless space and time. The awe which that contemplation inspires gives his religion a resonance which is wanting in that of the positivist. But Catholics believe in God and in Divine Providence; and they feel the need of a special place devoted to His service, because men are socially as well as individually bound to Divine worship. And they do not think that any sort of a place is good enough for the purpose. Their faith and love, and their feeling of homage, would express themselves not merely in bricks and mortar, but in beauty of architecture, painting, and sculpture. The Protestant cannot understand that, because he cannot appreciate the Catholic ideal; and I do not blame him. He thinks that a quadrilateral edifice, with bare walls like a barn, is enough. And why not, since he has nothing to put in it? For him God is present in the

church only as He is present in one's home, in the fields, or in the woods. The Irish people, with their instinctive insight into religious ideals, commonly call a Protestant place of worship "the preaching church." But Catholics believe in the Real Presence; and, therefore, instead of a communion table which satisfies the purpose of Protestantism, they employ art to build a church and an altar of beauty around the tabernacle where the Incarnate God reposes under the Sacramental Species. They believe in the veneration and intercession of Saints, and memorials of them in the from of frescoes or statues is another element of adornment and expense.

Sir Horace Plunkett says that "the best monument to a clergyman's influence and earnestness must always be found in the moral character and the spiritual fibre of his flock, and not in the marbles and mosaics of a gaudy edifice." I quite agree with him. But I thought it was generally acknowledged, at least outside the narrow mind of Irish Protestantism, that the "moral character" of Irish Catholics stood high amongst the people of Christendom; and it is just that "moral character and spiritual fibre" which would express its idea of human homage to God in those churches which he calls "excessive and extravagant." Catholic faith refuses to measure its expression by utilitarian standards; such as, how many square feet will give kneeling room to so many of a congregation, or will seat so many worshippers? Would not a plain table which could be bought for a few shillings at any second-hand furniture shop do for an altar? Does not a table serve that purpose when Mass is said in private houses? Did rock ledges not serve that purpose in the Penal days when Irish Catholic faith was as deep as martyrdom? And anyone who holds to the utilitarian view of church-building must admit that those questions imply what is true, and yet everyone who reads them will at once say that they imply what is

ridiculous. And so they do. But the Catholic religious ideal is not the ideal of utilitarian industrialism. They are incommensurable quantities, as the mathematicians say. What is enough for economics is not enough for Catholic faith.

What the supernatural faith of Catholics demands the æsthetic sense of Ruskin sees in the natural fitness of things. He writes:—*

"Now, this Lamp, or Spirit, of Sacrifice prompts us to the offering of precious things, merely because they are precious, not because they are useful or necessary. It is a spirit, for instance, which of two marbles, equally beautiful, applicable and durable, would choose the more costly, because it was so, and of two kinds of decorations, equally effective, would choose the more elaborate because it was so, in order that it might in the same compass present more cost and more thought. It is, therefore, the most unreasoning and enthusiastic, and perhaps best negatively defined, as the opposite of the prevalent feeling of modern times, which desires to produce the largest results at the least cost. . . . Now, it cannot but at first appear futile to assert the expediency of self-denial for its own sake, when, for so many sakes, it is every day necessary to a far greater degree than any of us practise it. But I believe it is just because we do not enough acknowledge or contemplate it as a good in itself, that we are apt to fail in its duties when they become imperative, and to calculate with some partiality, whether the good purposed to others measures or warrants the amount of grievance to ourselves, instead of accepting with gladness the opportunity of sacrifice as a personal advantage. . . . . Can the Deity be indeed honoured by the presentation to Him of any material object of value, or by any direc-

* The Seven Lamps of Architecture. Chap. I., pp. 10, 11. 16, 19

tion of zeal or wisdom which is not immediately beneficial to men?

It has been said—it ought always to be said, for it is true—that a better and more honourable offering is made to our Master in ministry to the poor, in extending the knowledge of His name, in the practice of the virtues by which that name is hallowed, than in material presents to His temple. Assuredly it is so; woe to all who think that any other kind or manner of offering may in any wise take the place of these. Do the people need a place to pray, and call to hear his word? Then it is no time for smoothing pillars or carving pulpits; let us have enough first of walls and roofs. . . . But let us examine ourselves and see if this be the reason for our backwardness in the lesser work. The question is not between God's House and His poor; it is not between God's House and His Gospel. It is between God's House and ours. Have we no tesselated colours on our floors? no frescoed fancies on our roofs? no niched statuary in our corridors? no gilded furniture in our chambers? no costly stones in our cabinets? Has even a tithe of these been offered? They are or they ought to be, the signs that enough has been devoted to the great purposes of human stewardship, and that there remains to us what we can spend in luxury; but there is a greater and prouder luxury than this selfish one—that of bringing a portion of such things as these into sacred service, and presenting them for a memorial that our pleasure as well as our toil has been hallowed by the remembrance of Him who gave both the strength and the reward. And until this is done, I cannot see how such possessions can be retained in happiness. I do not understand the feeling which would arch our own gates and pave our own thresholds and leave the church with its narrow door and foot-worn sill; the feeling which enriches our own chambers with all manner of

costliness, and endures the bare wall and mean compass of the temple. . . . I say this emphatically that the tenth part of the expense which is sacrificed in domestic vanities, if not absolutely and meaninglessly lost in domestic discomforts and incumbrances would, if collectively offered and wisely employed, build a marble church for every town in England; such a church as it would be a joy and a blessing, even to pass near in our daily ways and walks, and as it would bring the light into the eyes to see from afar, lifting its fair height above the purple crowd of humble roofs. . . . It is not the church that we want, but the sacrifice; not the emotion of admiration, but the act of adoration; not the gift, but the giving. . . . Let us not ask of what use our offering is to the church; it is at least better for *us* than if it had been retained for ourselves. It may be better for others also; there is at any rate a chance of this; though we must always fearfully and widely shun the thought that the magnificence of the temple can materially add to the efficiency of the worship or to the power of the ministry. Whatever we do, or whatever we offer, let it not interfere with the simplicity of the one, or abate, as if replacing, the zeal of the other."

In a foot-note to the above, he writes—"Thirteen lines of vulgar attack on Roman-Catholicism are here omitted, with much gain to the chapter's grace, and purification of its truth." Sir Horace Plunkett would do well to follow his example if another edition of his book is called for; from others of our critics we neither ask nor expect it.

The utilitarians do not seem to be governed by their own standards in the case of buildings for profane uses. Why the waste of elaborate architecture in the National Museum in Dublin? Would not plain walls and roofing shelter its antiquarian treasures quite as well? Nelson's

monument was built at an enormous cost; and as a monument it has no meaning, for the Irish people have never held him in honour, but they were forced to pay for his monument. The Corporation of Belfast, "the home of the strictly civic virtues and efficiencies," according to Sir Horace Plunkett, insist that anyone building or repairing a business house in the city shall have the front enriched with architectural adornments. We observe the same non-utilitarian expense in Banks, Insurance Offices, Custom Houses, Court Houses, and in the new College of Science for whose expensive architecture Sir Horace himself is responsible. The houses of many landlords cost a great deal more than the local house of God. Kylemore house and place probably cost more than all the Catholic Churches in Connaught. Would he say that those structures "shock the economic sense?" And if not, why not? Since buildings which would cost a great deal less would serve their purpose just as well, and in some cases the cost has brought their owners to bankruptcy. I do not find fault with those buildings and their expensive appurtenances; for a thing of beauty, sacred or profane, is a joy for ever. But the utilitarians who have the economic sense strongly developed should in consistency condemn them as "excessive and extravagant." Yet I have never heard of such condemnation made in public by those who look at the cost of Catholic Churches as through a microscope. It is only when a beautiful house is built to God that they discern extravagance and excess. The root of the difference between Catholics and men like Prof. Ruskin on the one hand, and the ordinary utilitarian economist on the other hand, seems to be a difference in the depth of faith and in the perception of the fitness of things. I have seen it recorded, with what correctness I cannot say, that about £400,000 was spent in connection with the King's coronation.

From an economist's point of view it might have been done for a small fraction of that sum; but I have not heard that any economist has been scandalized at the cost. I am not now complaining; I merely make a note of it, to point a contrast.

If the economist's ideal had always obtained we should have no St. Peter's at Rome, no Cathedrals of Milan, Cologne, Westminster, Salisbury, or York, or the old Abbey Churches of Ireland; and yet we glory in the faith of our fathers which expressed itself in those monuments of beauty. The ordinary Protestant mind cannot understand that; and consequently those memorials of spiritual enthusiasm were not inspired by Protestantism.

Yet, Protestants possess them in these countries. When Protestantism arose it rejected all the Catholic doctrines which it found inconvenient, and laid hold of all the Catholic churches which it cared about or could. Unlike positivism, and the brood of other modern isms which Protestantism has begotten in time, it did not cast all the clothes of Catholicism. It would have churches, but its founders would not bear the cost of building them. They found a more economic way—their plan of church provision in Ireland was as simple as plunder. They would worship God; so they broke the Seventh Commandment in order to fulfil the First. What is troubling them here in Ireland is, not that our churches are too expensively built, but that we have any churches at all. I do not include Sir Horace Plunkett in the number of those to whom I allude; I willingly exclude him, although his words have supplied me with a text. For, why should the excessive expense give them trouble since they have not been asked to share it? They appropriated the churches which our fathers built; they burnt some; others they let go to ruin. They now find that on the one hand their vandalism has been in vain, and that on the other hand the Catholic Church

has arisen from its ashes. They will never forgive us for having survived. "*Primum humani ingenii est, odisse quem laeseris.*"* Time was, and only two or three generations ago, when, despoiled of their churches and not permitted to build others, the Catholics of Ireland who lived in the country had to worship God in the woods and amidst the mountains; and those who lived in cities gathered together in garrets, as when the parishioners of St. Michan's in Dublin used to hear Mass in a back room in Hangman's Lane. As soon as the dawn of liberty broke upon them they began to build; but they had to struggle against other difficulties than poverty; such, for instance, as when so late as forty years ago, the parish priest of Carrigaholt, Co. Clare, had a van constructed on wheels in which he said Mass on Sundays and Holidays, and which he had moved from place to place for the convenience of the people. The landlord would not let him have a perch of ground on which to build a church, nor even a school unless on the condition of proselytism. Dean White, who was then a young priest in Carrigaholt, has told the story of "The Little Ark," as it was called, in an interesting booklet of the Catholic Truth Society, from which I learn that it is still preserved in the parish church as a memorial of the things that were. That was late in the morning of the Catholic revival; it was the time of thatched chapels which our grandfathers built both because they were poor, and because they dreaded publicity, or were afraid to show their strength. Then came the fulness of day. A new generation of Catholics had arisen. They cast off the winding bands from their limbs, and began to walk erect in the presence of their oppressors. With that generation began to appear one by one those churches which "shock the economic sense" of our neighbours, not because they paralyse Catholic industry or consume

*Tacitus: *Agricola*, 42.

Catholic money, but because they vindicate the indestructibility of Irish Catholic faith and patriotism which the prototypes of the new-born patrons of our temporal prosperity had done their worst to destroy. Those new churches are the expression of Irish Catholic faith to-day; the ruins of our old churches stand in their desolation, the memorials of Protestant injustice, the neglected relics of their shame. Protestants, amongst whom I number certain nondescripts who go by the name of "Catholic," are sorely tried by the extravagance of our modern church-building, since it absorbs money which they say might be spent in other and better ways, and they express the keenest sympathy with us in our want of wealth. If we had not been robbed of our old churches we should not now have to "shock their economic sense" by spending money on new ones, which they say would be more usefully spent in industrial activity, or in giving employment to the poor. That is the cry; but they cannot claim a patent for it. They have been anticipated by a prototype who has become notorious. When Mary brought the alabaster-box of ointment to anoint the feet of the Divine Founder of the Catholic Church, there was one present whose economic sense was shocked. In his pretended love for the needy he cried out, "Why was not this ointment sold for 300 pence and given to the poor?" —why this waste? That philanthropist was Judas Iscariot. And curious to think, it was St. John, the Evangelist of love, who makes this commentary on his conduct —"Now, he said this, not because he cared for the poor; but because he was a thief, and having the purse, carried the things that were put therein." Now, I propose a question, the solution of which will throw much light on the question I am discussing—Which was more faithful to Christ and had more sympathy for the poor, Iscariot, the philanthropic economist who was scandalised at Mary's extravagance, or St. John who said that her critic

had his heart, not in the poor, but in the purse? If Judas lived in Ireland to-day he would probably shed crocodile tears over the poverty of the people, whilst money is squandered in raising Churches to God; and he would say—"Why this waste? Many factories could be equipped for the money thus squandered; and the Department could be subsidised to carry on its mission of industrial revival in Ireland." It was the expensive ointment purchased to honour Christ that shocked the "economic sense" of Iscariot of old; it would be the expensive churches raised to honour Christ which would shock his "economic sense" if he lived in Ireland to-day. Churches have been springing up over the country during the past fifty years and more. The clergy have naturally taken the initiative in that revival—and they have never been forgiven for it. That is the philosophy of church-building criticisms in a nut-shell. If they had let the old thatched chapels go to ruin, or if they had replaced them only by chapels equally poor, the expedient piety of our critics would probably express itself, with clasped hands, eyes turned prayerfully to heaven, a tear of compassion for the poor in their eye, and the following cry of indignation on their lips. "Oh, those Romish mercenaries! See their neglect! They have let the houses of God become hovels! The people, out of the fulness of a living faith, have been ready for two generations since we emancipated them, with their subscriptions, waiting to be called upon by those whom they look to as their spiritual guides and leaders. But they have been waiting in vain; no call ever came."

But, perhaps, I am beating the air; the protest is not against church-building, but against "excess and extravagance" in that praiseworthy work. That brings me to the economic aspect of the work, which I will now consider.

III.

I HAVE hitherto considered chiefly the differences between the Catholic and non-Catholic motives and ideals in church-building. But, what Sir Horace Plunkett finds fault with is not the building of churches to a reasonable number or cost, but the "excessive and extravagant church-building in the heart and at the expense of poor communities."

Now, let us consider this church-building, as to the number of churches.

In Ireland there are 2,417 Catholic Churches for 3,308,000 Catholics.

In Great Britain there are 1,954 Catholic Churches for 2,013,400 Catholics.

In the United States there are 11,000 Catholic Churches for 12,000,000.

That is to say:—In the United States every 1,090 Catholics are provided with a church; in Great Britain, every 1,030 Catholics are provided with one; in Ireland, there is a church for every 1,368 Catholics. I have no knowledge of the churches in the United States. But I can speak of those in Great Britain, and I am convinced that, taken one with another, they are more expensive than those in Ireland. More expensive and more numerous! but I have never heard that the "economic sense" of our critics has been shocked by their "excess and extravagance," although they have been for the most part built, and have been almost entirely kept up by the pennies of the Irish poor. But Catholic Ireland is looked upon as a fair target for everyone. The truth is, it is hated by those who have tried in vain to destroy it. The Irish Catholic across the Atlantic or across the Channel, may, with impunity and out of his poverty, build churches, as many and as costly as he likes; but the Irish Catholic at home should have garnered his savings exclusively to

keep up supplies for the spendthrift absentee, and because he has thought fit to build his own churches in his own way he is held up to public scorn as wanting in those "civic virtues and efficiencies" which are said to find their home in the North.

Again, there are in Ireland, 1,362 Protestant Incumbents for 581,089 Episcopalian Protestants—I am leaving out the Presbyterians, Methodists, and others. But, many Incumbents have more than one church; some of them have three. If we fix the number of churches at 1,500, which I believe to be a low estimate, we find that whilst every 320 Protestants are provided with a church, there is only a church for every 1,368 Catholics. I will be reminded that 320 Protestants could better afford to build a church than 1,368 Catholics. I admit it. I am not at all accusing them of extravagance in church-building. Far from it; their churches are to me a symbol, not of their extravagance, but of their "economic sense," inasmuch as most of these have been built at the expense of Catholics. I do not refer to the old churches of which they despoiled our forefathers; I refer to modern churches built even within the 19th century. Sir Horace Plunkett has not made a full indictment of extravagance in church-building against the Catholics of Ireland. I take leave to add another item to the charge. He indicts Catholics only for extravagance in building churches for themselves; I indict them for the additional extravagance of building churches for Protestants also.

Amongst the most shameless iniquities which the Catholics of Ireland have had to bear in modern times were the Vestry Laws. A few Protestants met together, and, without let, hindrance, control, or responsibility of any sort, levied a cess at their discretion or caprice on the Catholics for the building or the repairing of their church, for cleaning it, for ringing the bell, for washing

the parson's surplice, buying wine for the Communion, paying the parish clerk, the pew-openers, and vestry-maids, etc. It was bad enough that Catholics should have to bear these burdens at all, but it was worse that they should not dare to ask if they were necessary, had no option but to pay whatever applottment it pleased the vestrymen to levy. From 1725, when Catholics were excluded from having a voice in vestries, the powers of these bodies passed through three processes of extension till it came to this, that the Protestant bishop was empowered to unite for any such cess purpose any parish he chose, even though there was not a Protestant in it, to another parish where the vestrymen determined to build or to repair a church. It depended on them to assign what value they thought fit to each one's property, to levy a cess accordingly, and then let the churchwardens loose upon the Catholics whom they had decreed to fleece. Thus wealthy Protestants could escape scot-free, whilst the poor Catholics, fleeced already for their rents, were fleeced anew for their churches. Thus the Catholics of a district were often made to bear the burden of building a church for Protestants who perhaps lived fifty miles away. Thus had the burden of Protestant church-building to be borne not only by Catholics who lived where Protestants were, but also by those who lived where Protestants were not. That is a count which Sir Horace Plunkett has not put into his indictment against the Catholics of Ireland.

They appropriated the old Catholic churches; they confiscated Catholic church property also, which, when Catholics held it, bore the burden of churches and schools. They turned that to personal use, although they had the tithes besides; and withal they let the churches go to ruin.* Then Government gave them grants for the

*In a speech delivered in 1763 by Sir Lucius O'Brien, M.P. for Ennis, he said that in 62 out of the 76 parishes of the County

building and repairs of churches, which should have been done out of the church property. From 1760 to 1800 they received Government grants for church-building and glebe-houses to the amount of £250,000. Between 1800 and 1812, they received over £200,000 for the same purposes.† Notwithstanding all these church revenues and Government grants, they made the Catholics build and repair their churches through the church cesses levied by the vestries. So constant and enormous were these church cesses that the scandal could no longer be disguised, and in 1825, a Government enquiry made revelations of sacrilegious dishonesty, before which the frauds, filth, and dishonesty for which a previous

Clare no Protestant Church existed, that the rectors of them were non-resident, and that 'therefore the inhabitants of many parishes were reduced either to the total neglect of all religious duties or to have recourse to a Popish priest.'

In a *Letter to the Bishops and Clergy of Ireland*, published in 1760, it is said:—"There are 1,600 parish churches in the kingdom in ruins, and of the 600 that are standing, one-third are ready to tumble, and the clergy do not reside as they ought to." Cf. also *The English State Church in Ireland*, by Dr. Maziere Brady, and *The History of the Catholic Association*, by Sir Thomas Wyse, page 254.

† I take the following from that very exhaustive work *on Ireland and her Churches*, by James Godkin, published in 1867. Pages xvii. and xviii. Introduction.

"From a return made to Parliament on 24th July, 1803, it appears that the number of parishes in Ireland then was 2,436; of benefices, 1,120; of churches, 1,001; and of glebe houses, 355. This represents the state of the Established Church in the year 1791.

"From a Parliamentary return ordered in 1826, it appears that within the present century the following amounts had been voted by Parliament up to that date:—Gifts for building churches, £224,946; loans for building churches, £286,572; total, £511,538, for building churches in 25 years.

"During the same period gifts were made for glebes, £61,484; gifts for glebe houses, £144,734. Loans were granted for the same purpose amounting to £222,291, making a total for glebes and glebe houses, £428,509. Thus, between the year 1791 and 1826 the Establishment obtained for churches and glebes the sum of £940,047. The number of glebe houses in 1826 was increased to 771, and of benefices to 1396. The number of cures with non-residence was 286."

Government Commission had denounced the Charter schools were but a shadow. If I had space I would give some specimens taken from the Report of that Commission of 1825; they would be amusing, if they were not disgusting. Some of those churches were built in parishes where there was hardly a Protestant besides the parson's family. At Tulla, Co. Clare, they built one beside the ruined Abbey on the hill, and then, to save the trouble of reaching it, they built another in the plain.

Little wonder they cannot appreciate how we build our churches, since that is how they have built their own. That is how these men of "civic virtues and efficiencies" showed their "economic sense"—and their sense of justice and public decency.

So much for the Catholic churches in Ireland as to number. Now, as to cost. What we do not approve in the churches which you, Roman Catholics, have been building, says the typical Protestant critic, is, that they cost too much for your poverty. Now, the short answer to that is—Who has asked for your approval? When you are asked to bear a share of the cost, it will be time for you to complain; but since our churches, reasonable or extravagant, have cost you nothing, we request you to mind your own business. It is we who have made our churches, not you; it is you who have made our poverty, not we. In either case, what is our glory is your shame. We are proud of those churches, and of the faith which, in spite of your oppression, has lived to build them. In your hatred you did your worst to extinguish it, in your anger you revile it for having survived. We are proud of our poverty too—not,however, of that poverty in itself, which we regret, but rather of the fidelity to conscience and to honour which has kept us poor. And it is a strange irony that those who despoiled us of nearly all we owned should now turn to advise us how to economise the little

we have left, in relation to the activity of our faith which has outlived their injustice. It seems as if they are ashamed of the history they have made in this matter, and, like Mr. Chamberlain who tried to direct the thoughts of the British public from the expensive folly of the Boer war to the economic wisdom of protective tariffs, they want to erase our poverty from their own account, and to place it to the credit of what they call our church-building extravagance.

I have tried to roughly estimate the cost of all the Catholic churches which exist in Ireland at present. The vast majority of them are rural. Most of them date from the first half of the last century; a great many are small and plain; most of them were built at a time when building cost much less than it costs now. In country places, where the vast majority of the churches are, a great deal of expense is saved by the help which is gratuitously given by the people in the form of labour and horse-work, etc. Taking the large and the small, the old and the new, a most competent clerk of works, of wide and long experience, whom I have consulted, tells me that their average cost would be about £2,000. A priest of much experience and judgment in church-building, thinks that average considerably too high. If we fix an estimate between both we get about £4,000,000, as the whole cost; and, deducting from that the money which has come from outside, especially from America, we find that all which has been spent by the Catholics of Ireland on church-building is about £3,000,000.* We must not look on that sum in the

* Since the above was written I have read a pamphlet on "*The Progress of Catholicity in Ireland in the 19th century*," by Myles O'Reilly, B.A., LL.D., M.P. It was read first before the Congress of Mechlin, and then published in 1865. He collected information from the Irish Bishops on the cost of the Churches built in their respective dioceses, during the previous 65 years of the century, and he gives the result in an appendix. There were 1,842 churches, built at a cost of £3,098,627. Judging by analogy from

same light as money spent on extra-rents, extra-taxes, or extra-drink, which disbursements are renewed from year to year. A similar outlay shall not have to be renewed for 200 years more, unless, which is not likely, those who appropriated our old churches should celebrate a ter-centenary of their confiscations by appropriating our new churches also, for most of their own, or rather those which we have built for them, will have gone to ruin, and they are not likely to shock their "economic sense" by wasting money on others to replace them. But the annual drink bill for Ireland is about £13,000,000. The duty alone on the drink-bill is about £6,000,000; to which Catholics, unfortunately, contribute their share. What was paid as extra-rent before the Land Courts came, that is to say, money paid almost exclusively by Irish Catholics who made and rightfully owned it, to those who legally claimed but did not own it, amounted each year to vastly more than has been spent on all the churches in Ireland for the last hundred years. Moreover, that yearly drain was not a mere passing of so much money from one class in the country to another; it was so much wrongfully wrung from the people, taken out of the country, and spent abroad. According to the Report of the Recess Commission, we pay as much each year over and above our just share of Imperial taxes as we have spent on all our churches.

The Catholics of Ireland paid in any five years for the support of the Protestant Church before its Disestablishment, for which they got no value whatever, as

the number of churches built in the diocese of Limerick since then, I estimate the cost of the churches built in Ireland since the beginning of the 19th century down to the present at £5,000,000; and deducting £1,000,000 as having come from abroad, there would remain £4,000,000 contributed in Ireland. I believe my estimate is rather high.

much as they have spent in church-building for a hundred years. The tithe-rent charge was really, though indirectly, paid almost exclusively by Catholics. Our share in the cost of the Boer war is probably much more than we have paid in church-building for the past hundred years. The Department during the four years of its existence, has consumed as much money as all the Catholic churches which have been built in Ireland for the past thirty years. With the exception of this last, all those other expenses are looked upon by Irish Catholics as extravagant and worse. They were compulsory contributions moreover, not the spontaneous offerings of their convictions.

Now, what element is it that makes the "excess and extravagant church-building in the heart, and at the expense of poor communities" in Ireland "shock the economic sense?" It was money spent on Catholic churches; that seems to be the head and front of the economic offence. Sir Horace Plunkett is good enough to write:—"This expenditure, however, has been incurred; and no one, I take it would advocate the demolition of existing religious edifices on the ground that their erection has been unduly costly! The moral is for the present and the future, and applies not merely to economy in new buildings, but also in the decoration of existing churches."* One is surprised that a calm thinker like Sir Horace did not see, whilst he was writing those words, that he, a non-Catholic, was laying himself open to a charge of the plainest impertinence. Let him keep his soul in peace; the buildings erected shall not be demolished, and those which Catholics think well to build will be built. I am sure he was quite unconscious of the offensive character of those words when he wrote them; but he has been misled all along by measuring Catholic religious work by Protestant ideas.

* Page 109.

John Mitchell was reading Macaulay's essay on Bacon one day on board H. M. S. *Scourge*, on his way to Bermuda; after which he wrote down the following reflections on utilitarian philosophy which I think very much to my purpose.† I respectfully offer them to Sir Horace as sauce wherewith to season his economics:—

"What a very poor fool Jesus Christ would have been, judged by the 'new philosophy'—for his aim and Plato's were one. He disdained to be useful in the matter of our little comforts; yes, indeed 'he could not condescend to the humble office of ministering to the comfort of human beings.' On the contrary, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are holy, if there be any virtue.

"Why, good Messiah, this is the mere Academy over again. Have you considered that these are unattainable frames of mind? You offer us living bread, and water which he that drinketh shall not thirst again; very beautiful, but too romantic. Can you help us to butter the mere farinaceous bread we have got, to butter it first on one side and then on the other?—to improve the elemental taste and somewhat too paradisaic weakness of this water? These are our vulgar wants; these are what the mass of mankind agrees to call good. Whatsoever things are snug, whatsoever things are influential—if there be any comfort, if there be any money, think on these things. Henceforth we acknowledge no light of the world which does not light our way to good things like these.

"Almost this sounds profanely; but the profanity belongs to the essayist. His comparison of Plato's philosophy with modern inventive genius is exactly as reasonable as if he had compared the Christian religion with the same. Ancient philosophy was indeed natural re-

†*Jail Journal*: pp. 42, 43, 44, 45. I should like to quote from pp. 37 to 42 also, but for the length of it.

ligion—was an earnest striving after spiritual truth and good; it dealt with the supersensuous and nobler part of man; and its 'aim' was to purify his nature, and give him hope of an immortal destiny amongst the enthroned gods on sainted seats.

"Just so, says the essayist; that was what they called wisdom—this is what I, Lord Bacon and I, call wisdom. 'The end which the great Lord Bacon proposed to himself was the multiplying of human enjoyments and the mitigating of human sufferings.' Anything beyond this we simply ignore; let all the inquirings, all the aspirings of mankind stop here. Leave off dreaming of your unattainable frames of mind, and be content with the truth as it is in Bacon.

"I can imagine an enlightened inductive Baconian standing by with scornful nose as he listens to the Sermon on the Mount, and then taking the preacher sternly to task—'What mean you by all this'—"Bless them that curse you"—"Love your enemies"—"Be ye perfect as your Father in Heaven is perfect." What mortal man ever attained these frames of mind? Why not turn your considerable talents, friend, to something useful, something within reach? Can you make anything? improve anything? You are, if I mistake not, a carpenter to trade, and have been working somewhere in Galilee; now have you invented any little improvement in your own respectable trade? Have you improved the saw, the lathe, the plane? Can you render the loom a more perfect machine, or make a better job of the potter's wheel? Have you in any shape economized materials, economized human labour, added to human enjoyment? Have you done, or can you show the way to do, any of all these things? No. 'Then away with him. Crucify him.'

"Ah, but the enlightened Briton would say, now you talk of religion; that is our strong point in this admir-

able age and country. Is not there our venerable church?—our beautiful liturgy? There is a department for all that, with the excellent Archbishop of Canterbury at the head of it. If information is wanted about the other world, or salvation, or anything in that line, you can apply at the head-office, or some of the subordinate stations.

"True, there is a department, and offices, and salaries, more than enough; yet the very fact is, that modern British civilization (which may be called the child of this great British teacher) is not only not Christian, but is not so much as Pagan. It takes not the smallest account of anything higher or greater than earth bestows. The hopeless confusion of ideas that made Bacon and Macaulay institute a comparison between ancient philosophy and modern ingenuity, has grown characteristic of the national mind and heart, and foreshadows national death. The mass of mankind agree to call money, power, and pleasure, good; and behold the Spirit of the Age has looked on it, and pronounced it very good. The highest phase of human intellect and virtue is to be what this base spirit calls a philanthropist—that is, one who, by new inventions and comfortable contrivances, mitigates human suffering, heightens human pleasure. The grandest effort of godlike genius is to augment human power—power over the elements, power over uncivilized men,—and all for our own comfort. Nay, by tremendous enginery of steam, and electricity, and gunpowder—by capital and the "law of progress," and the superhuman power of co-operation, this foul Spirit of the Age does veritably count upon scaling the heavens. The failure of Otus and Ephialtes, of Typhaeus and Enceladus, of the builders of Shinar, never daunts him a whit; for why? they knew little of co-operation; electricity and steam, and the principle of the arch, were utterly hidden from

them; civil engineering was in its infancy; how should they not fail?

"The very capital generated and circulated, and utilized on so grand a scale by civilized men now-a-days, seems to modern Britons a power mighty enough to wield worlds; and its numen is worshipped by them accordingly, with filthy rites. The God of mere nature will, they assure themselves, think twice before he disturbs and quarrels with such a power as this; for, indeed, it is faithfully believed in the city, by the moneyed circles there, that God the Father has money invested in the three-per-cents., which makes him careful not to disturb the peace of the world, or suffer the blessed march of "civilization" to be stopped.

"Semble then, first, that the peace of the world is maintained so long as it is only the unmoneyed circle that are robbed, starved, and slain; and, second, that nothing civilizes either gods or men like holding stock.

"But I am strong in the belief that the portentous confusion, both of language and thought, which has brought us to all this, and which is no accidental misunderstanding, but a radical confounding of the English national intellect and language, a chronic addlement of the general brain, getting steadily worse now for two hundred years, is indeed more alarming than the gibbering of Babel, and is symptomatic of a more disastrous ending. By terrible signs and wonders it shall be made known that comfort is not the chief end of man.

"I do affirm (1) that capital is not the ruler of the world, that the Almighty has no pecuniary interest in the stability of the funds or the European balance of power. Finally, that no engineering, civil or military, can raise man above the heavens or shake the throne of God.

"On that day some nations that do now bestride the narrow world will learn lessons of true philosophy, but

not new philosophy, in sackcloth and ashes. And other nations, low enough in the dust now, will arise from their sackcloth and begin a new national life—to repeat, it may be, the same crimes and suffer the same penalties. For the progress of the species is circular; or possibly in trochoidal curves, with some sort of cycloid for deferent; or more properly it oscillates, describing an arc of a circle, pendulum-wise; and even measures time (by aeons) in that manner; or let us say, in one word, the world wags. . . . . ."

This day I saw a lamp placed before the altar of the Blessed Sacrament in a new church. It is the gift of a family, and cost about £100. From a utilitarian point of view, a common kitchen lamp would do as well. Why then spend £100 on one? It is an act of Catholic faith, a spontaneous expression of worship. The industrial economists who read this will at once say—"Oh! the gift of some pious old maid, or unthinking old man." No, although a man of deep and simple piety, he is one of the most successful and enterprising merchants in Ireland, who has branches of his trade in more than one continent. I believe that he is so much Sir Horace Plunkett's superior in practical economics, that if they both started business in a strange place he would be everywhere and Sir Horace nowhere; although if I asked him whether he belonged to the economic school of Smith, Ricardo, or Mill, he would, I am sure, smile at my simplicity. A comparatively poor woman, before leaving Ireland with the intention of never returning, made the gift of a Monstrance which cost £100 to the same church. It was unexpected and spontaneous; she insisted on its being accepted. Now, from a utilitarian point of view, a Monstrance made of block tin would do as well. Again, it was an expression of faith and worship. I take the following from a discourse delivered last Sunday by the bishop of Limerick:—"If

there is anything wrong in making the house of God rich and beautiful, then the laity are quite as culpable as the clergy. Yet it is strange what a personal interest they take in the Church. The poorest and humblest amongst them regard it as their own, and are proud of it, and with some instinctive untutored feeling recognise and warm to what is good and true in its architecture or its decoration. I had a very interesting instance recently of the high views which the laity entertain in these matters. I got a letter from an old lady living in Brooklyn, in the United States of America, in which she sent me 10,000 dollars for the improvement of the church of the parish where she was born. She emigrated to America about fifty years ago, in the great exodus of our poor people after the famine. She was a young girl at the time, and she went, or rather as millions of our race, was driven from her old home to seek a livelihood abroad. God blessed her, and she prospered. She married, and her children grew up, and were provided for, and having good means at her disposal, in her old age, her heart untravelled turns to the home of her childhood, and in the undying faith of the people of Ireland her thoughts, after all these years, go back to the poor little humble church where she heard Mass on Sundays long ago—to that living centre of all that is happiest and brightest in the lives of the Irish peasants, and she would wish to use some means with which God had blessed her in doing something for the beauty of that house which, in a desolate land, shed on her and hers, in their darkest days—the one gleam of light, the one ray of hope, that upheld them in all their sorrows. But what I wish to direct your particular attention to are the detailed instructions which she gives me. She desires that the altar should be of marble. That is the spontaneous thought of this old Irish woman, and in this she is a type." Ruskin could see the propriety and the meaning of those gifts, although not in

the same light as those who gave them; and if an economist like Sir Horace Plunkett asked him for a reason he might reply that

"There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio!
Than are dreamt of in your philosophy."

Naturalism cannot see the meaning of such donations; but it will at once find an economic niche into which it would fit the payment of as much for the use of a balcony whilst a Royal procession is passing as that Lamp and Monstrance cost. Those gifts were not made on any principle of economics, but on the principle of faith. Yet, they have an economic value inasmuch as they further Irish art and distribute so much money amongst so many artists. In like manner, church-building, though not done from economic causes, has economic results. It implies quarry-work, stone-cutting, carpentry, masonry, stucco-work, brass-work, painting, etc. The money which is subscribed in a parish towards the building of a church is distributed amongst workmen, and circulates through them again amongst business people and those who gave it. Then we must bear in mind that a church is not an expense which has to be periodically repeated, it lasts for generations, and the more expensively it is built, the longer it lasts. It is, besides, an object of beauty before the eyes of the people; and in remote places, where objects of art are never otherwise seen, it has an educative and a refining influence.

That is a satisfactory explanation, a utilitarian economist will reply, if the people can afford it; but when so much expense is taken from poverty it is "misdirected zeal." Now, the priests who are responsible for the churches which have been built during the past century in Ireland might point to them in evidence that they have not been idle or neglectful of the religious concerns of the people; and they might also retort that if

their critics, who claim to have a monopoly of economic acquirements and to be the natural leaders of the people in their material concerns, had devoted as much disinterested and constant care to the people's temporal interests as the priests have devoted to their religious concerns, those churches would not be built "in the heart, and at the expense of poor communities," but in the heart of a prosperous people. The poverty of the Irish people is mostly of their making, and partly the result of their neglect. When they claim to be the natural and the only capable leaders of the people, they do not seem to see that they cut their own throats; because the claim implies that they should and could have done much for the material well-being of the people, and they have done nothing.

It is not necessary to say that Sir Horace Plunkett has done his part—more than one man's part; and if the sacrifice of time, thought, and money, gives a man a right to speak, no man in Ireland has a better right than he has. For that reason, those criticisms which I am making on his book are not personal to him, although I am taking my texts from passages which he has irrelevantly, and I think unfortunately, written.

Again, looking over the country I do not know of many churches which could be called excessively expensive; I have known more costly churches raised by poorer congregations in England, where they have besides to build and support their schools. There are some which, in my opinion, are excessive; but they are much fewer than appears to be the case. I take the church in Nenagh as a type. I thought it extravagant, and I had the hardihood to say so to Dean White; but the explanation which he condescended to give, not only convinced me of my mistake, but gave me an object-lesson in humility which I hope shall not be lost on me. Instead of telling me to mind my own business he kindly told

me that when he had received tenders from contractors he found the cost so much beyond his power that he got the architect to draw a design which would cost less to execute. Meanwhile, one person told him to go on with the original plan, and placed at his disposal more than half the cost. Hence the beautiful church we see in Nenagh to-day; and, although very spacious, it is crowded every Sunday and Holiday, and at all the Masses, from the altar to the door.* He got a good deal

* The following letter from Mr. Hugh Law, M.P., appeared in the *Daily Express* of December 3rd, 1903, in reply to a sonnet by Prof. Tyrrell, of Trinity College, which the Bishop of Limerick made notorious by castigating its author, and to the Professor's apologetic letter in reply, which was more silly than the sonnet:—

SIR,—It not infrequently happens that the letters which people write in vindication of some action of theirs which has met with criticism serve an exactly opposite purpose.

That, I think, will be proved true of Dr. Tyrrell's letter in your columns some days ago. What a very strange document it is! First of all, he declares that he "never said, thought, or wrote anything against the Catholic religion," and then proceeds to repeat in prose what he had already stated in verse—viz., that "the Catholic clergy inculcate on their flocks cold acts of observance in lieu of sincere feelings of religion, and exact from an impoverished peasantry money to be spent on sacred buildings erected in places where no such edifices are needed, and where there are but a handful of worshippers to frequent them." And finally, he seeks to clinch his argument by a quotation from a writer in the *Daily Mail*, who finds in the cheap decorations of the Irish country chapel "the ugly expression of an ugly kind of disease," and who deplores (good Christian man!) the fact that "shillings of the people, cheerfully given to God instead of to the nourishment of themselves, have raised the fabric of these chapels."

I will not insist on the discrepancy between Dr. Tyrrell and his chosen witness on the point as to whether the shillings are "exacted" or "cheerfully given." My own knowledge, so far as it goes, indeed, bears out Mr. Young's rather than Dr. Tyrrell's view of the matter. I have known an old woman give literally and actually—nay, insist upon giving—all she had in the world towards the building of God's house, trusting with an apostolic faith (not often found, I regret to say, among Anglicans) that He to Whom she gave would not fail to remember her. Nor will I express more than a passing wonder in what part of Ireland are these churches erected with "but a handful of worshippers to frequent them." I do, indeed, recall many edifices where the congregations are very spare indeed; but, oddly enough, these

also from America and from his friends; so that the people were not called upon to bear half the burden of building it. The case of Nenagh is the case of several others which have come within my own knowledge. When all their history is known, I believe that very few of our churches are really so "excessive or extravagant" as they appear. In most cases what happens is that money comes in from outside and is distributed in the locality, rather than that money is drained away out of it. And

belong not to the Roman Catholic but to the Irish Church. On the other hand, many people must, like myself, be but too familiar with the spectacle of worshippers kneeling outside the doors of a Roman Catholic chapel during the celebration of the Mass, the interior of the building being too full to hold any more.

As to the first part of Dr. Tyrrell's invective, I do not know what the Roman Catholic clergy "inculcate" on their flocks (no more, I very strongly suspect, does Dr. Tyrrell), but I do know something of what those flocks believe. I live amongst a Catholic peasantry, and I have over and over again been amazed (and I must add, as an Anglican, humiliated) by the evangelical simplicity, fervour, and reality of the faith by the light of which they live their daily lives.

Dr. Tyrrell would be better employed, I am quite sure, in inculcating similarly "sincere feelings of religion" among the members of the Communion to which he and I both belong.

I have only to add that it is strange to find a man like himself objecting to sacrifices made for the sake of religion. I should have thought that it was rather a matter for congratulation that still, in one small portion at least, of the modern world, there are some few people who are still prepared to seek first the "Kingdom of God and His righteousness."—Very faithfully yours.

HUGH. A. LAW.

I find the following in *Truth* of May 19th, 1904:—"Regarding Cathedrals in Ireland, Dublin is in the curious position, as the Capital of a Catholic Country, of not alone possessing no Cathedral, but of having two Protestant Cathedrals. Late Anti-Catholic writers on Ireland, to whom Bacon's dictum that writing makes an exact man can hardly be applied, find great fault with, and trace the country's failures to the over numerous Catholic Churches. The fact of the two Protestant Cathedrals of Dublin escapes their notice, as well as the fact that the supply, as regards congregations, by no means demands so much accommodation. Neither do these writers record the undeniable fact that, however numerous the Catholic Churches may be, they one and all have congregations to fill them."

Their "Simpler Christianity" took, and has kept the churches; but it has not kept the congregations.

if a priest, wishing to build a church more costly than his parishioners could pay for, takes upon himself the strain of debt, and bears the burden of collecting it abroad, what right have I or anyone else to pass sentence on him? We would not do it ourselves, and we at once conclude that therefore nobody else should! At any rate, I have never known a person or a parish to be poorer for what their parish church cost. Whatever poverty appears over the face of Ireland is due to those alone whose representatives to-day want to patronize our poverty, and pretend to protect us from the priests.

From an æsthetic point of view, I have heard or read of those churches as "architectural monstrosities." I heard them severely condemned a few years ago for their want of artistic taste by one who put forth a good deal of knowledge, but who appeared to me to know very little about art. At any rate, I do not agree with those who condemn them in that wholesale manner. On the contrary I think that both in themselves, and as compared with similar churches in other countries, they are buildings of much beauty. I lived for several years in the birthplace and home of ecclesiastical art, and I think I did not lose my opportunity; I have seen nearly all the great churches of England and the Continent, some of them several times. I do not say this as if I claimed to be an authority, but as giving me the right to have an opinion. These criticisms have come chiefly from persons who are warm advocates for Irish art and artists; but they strangely forget that when they call those churches "horrible" they are condemning the Irish architects who designed them. Sir Horace Plunkett thinks that the decorations of the churches should be deferred until Irish art has had time to improve. His purpose is of course excellent; but how is Irish art to improve unless Irish artists have some objects upon which to work? And the chief patronage which Irish artists

have received has come from those who are connected with ecclesiastical art. To say that artists should first perfect themselves before they get an object on which to prove their skill is to turn the history of art inside out. If that idea were carried out in the history of art, the genius of Perugino would never probably have been known. If I were dealing with the subject of technical education, I would say that those who control it shall have to be cautious lest they be training persons who will go abroad to practice that skill which Ireland is paying to impart to them.

In the Epilogue which he has added to the new Edition of his book, he writes:—"My remarks as to the alleged excessive Church building were, I regret to say, made in a form which laid me open to misconception. Some readers feel that I did not make sufficient allowance for the fact that much Church building was absolutely required for the mere physical accommodation of a people among whom regular church attendance is practically universal, and who had been deprived of all the ancient churches in the country. It is also urged that the extravagance complained of is the exception and not the rule. All this I gladly admit. Still what strikes many observers is the undisputed fact that while the number of Catholic churches and religious houses is rapidly rising, the Catholic population itself is rapidly falling. Had the reverse been true, my strictures would have been more open to objection. I trust, however, that I shall give no fresh offence if I express the hope that the zeal now put forth in church building may find a counterpoise in a vigorous effort to improve the economic condition of a people who must be preserved to the country if the churches are not to be emptied of their worshippers."

On which I observe—(1) His remarks in the 1st Edition were quite as intelligible as those I have just

quoted. (2) Anyone who compares page 107 in both Editions will find the middle of the page changed, and in the new Edition he stealthily lets slide out of the text, without any allusion, a sentence in which he charges Catholics with unworthy motives in the Church-building movement, filling up the space with a few harmless expressions. I give the sentence in the Preface. (3) Whilst he slides over that charge he ostentatiously retracts two charges, one of which he did not make. (4) He revives the whole charge in a modified form in the 5th sentence. It is, unfortunately, true that the population is "rapidly falling;" but it is *not* true that the *number* of churches is "rapidly rising." He confounds the substitution of a new church for an old one as an increase in the number of churches. Would he want three contiguous parishes, the population of which has very much decreased, to let two churches go to ruin, and to repair the third, as spacious enough for the dwindled population, and let the people tramp a dozen miles to Mass? His reference to *Religious Houses* will be found dealt with in Chapter XXI. (5) The rather inelegant sarcasm wrapped up in the last sentence is blunted and deadened by his own spontaneous admissions at page 119 of his book; and, I hope, by what the reader will find in Chapter XI. of this book.

CHAPTER III.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND PROGRESS.

At pages 102 and 104 of his book, Sir Horace Plunkett writes:—"The industrial character of Roman Catholics in Ireland, however caused, seems to me to have been intensified by their religion. The reliance of that religion on authority, its repression of individuality, and its complete shifting of what I may call the moral centre of gravity to a future existence—to mention no other characteristics—appear to me calculated, unless supplemented by other influences, to check the growth of the qualities of initiative and self-reliance, especially amongst a people whose lack of education unfits them for resisting the influence of what may present itself to such minds as a kind of fatalism with resignation as its paramount virtue."

. . . . "While voluntary asceticism may have its justification, it behoves a Church to see that its members, while fully acknowledging the claims of another life, should develop the qualities which make for well-being in this life. In fact I believe that the influence of Christianity upon social progress will be best maintained by co-ordinating those spiritual and economic ideals in a philosophy of life broader and truer than any to which nations have yet attained."

This, then, is the process of his reasoning. Individuality and self-reliance are necessary for industrial progress. But the reliance of Catholics on authority represses individuality, and checks self-reliance. Therefore, the religion of Roman Catholics is

essentially an impediment to industrial progress. Moreover, industrial progress demands the development of the qualities of this life. But Catholicism completely shifts the moral centre of gravity to the other life. Hence the absence of those qualities in Catholics which make for industrial progress.

Now, I might admit all that, and pass it by as being outside the business of the Catholic Church. Even though I granted that Catholicism is an obstacle to industrial progress, there would be no ground for complaint unless it professed, or ought to have professed, to promote the temporal interests of man. To use Cardinal Newman's words: "Not till the State is blamed for not making Saints, may it fairly be laid to the fault of the Church that she cannot invent a steam-engine or construct a tariff."*

She has been the means of numberless temporal blessings to humanity; but she is not to be judged by these, since she does not take them within the scope of her institution or her work. As Card. Newman points out, "it is merely because she has often done so much more than she professes, it is really in consequence of her very exuberance of benefit to the world, that the world is disappointed that she does not display that exuberance always—like some hangers-on of the great, who come at length to think that they have a claim on their bounty."

The want which Sir Horace Plunkett finds in Catholicism, any Roman citizen would have found in the teaching of Christ. Any economist of old Rome might object that He made no provision for commercial enterprise, said nothing about the copper or corn trade in the Sermon on the Mount, in fact that His principles tended to tear up by the roots the very idea of Roman

* *Difficulties of Anglicans in Catholic Teaching*, pages 206, 211, 215.

citizenship. St. Paul, a Roman citizen, taught that "they who become rich fall into temptation, and into the snare of the devil, and into many unprofitable and hurtful desires which draw men into destruction and perdition;"—so opposed to what Juvenal writes of the prevailing Roman spirit of that time: "*Unde habeas quærit nemo, sed oportet habere;*" which I may translate:—How did you come by your wealth? is a question which is not asked in polite society; but it behoves you to have wealth.

The Christian is not obliged to forego wealth, but is warned of its dangers; the Pagan man of material progress must look on wealth as the one thing it behoves him to have, and must try to have it anyhow. To the mind of the Roman Imperialists, the early Christians no doubt wanted that individuality which, we are told, is wanting in Catholics to-day. Like the Catholicism of to-day, they placed their centre of gravity in another life. Yet, Roman society contained the germs of decay, and soon fell of its own weight and through its own rottenness. To Christianity fell the task of building up society again, and Christianity succeeded in the task.

Here, then, we have a people, great in peace and war, whose works of art we contemplate with admiration, in whose writers we still study literature, whose orators are models for us, on the writings of whose jurists the laws of modern Europe are based both as to principles and as to procedure. They had not the disadvantage of fixing their centre of gravity in the other life; their thoughts were entirely centred in the concerns of this. They had their agrarian and commercial quarrels as we have now, and able and ardent men amongst them studied the economic systems according to which the issues should be decided, without any reference whatever to the interests of any other life

than this. Sir Horace Plunkett, or a man of his temper of mind and bent of will, visiting Rome in those times, would at once discern those "strenuous qualities," those "civic virtues and efficiencies" which make for progress. But if he spent an evening at the house of Acilius Glabrio, the Consul, where he would probably meet Flavius Clemens, or other Christian converts of the Imperial household, I am sure his "economic sense" would be shocked by their conversation, their aspirations, and their ways. He would not hear a word about Juvenal's *oportet habere*, but a great deal about St. Paul's, "our conversation is in heaven."

Now, the end of these conquerors, economists, orators, artists, poets, and jurists, whose centre of gravity was quite *in terra firma*, came suddenly and soon; and these uneconomic Glabrios and Clemens and Domitillas whose "conversation was in heaven," fostered a new race of manhood out of their dissolution, just as new corn comes up when new elements bring back life to the elements into which the old seed had been corrupted. I set out from that time of social dissolution when Imperial Rome became the easy prey of the Northern Barbarians. Roman civilisation was crushed; society had gone into its primitive elements; ignorance, selfishness, passions supported by brute force tore amongst them all that was left of humanity and whatever relics remained of pagan progress. I begin at that time, because the only form of Christianity which then existed was Roman Catholicism, and because its field of labour was a human wilderness, vast and wild. Catholicism had, at that time, if ever it had, its Mass-idolatry, Image-worship, monkish ignorance, priestly domination, and a rich array of all those Romish superstitions which have been driven into their dark dens of ignorance by the meridian light which the Reformers brought—superstitions such as, we are told, are to be found "in backward districts"

of Ireland to-day "sapping all strength of will and purpose."

Here, then, we can fairly test the tendency of Catholicism in relation to human progress. Popery could do what it pleased in those days; and let the history of Europe for the next thousand years bear witness to its deeds. Civilisation unquestionably revived, human progress went on, and what power or influence under heaven but the Catholic Church was there to create the one and to foster the other? Amidst the mingling of races, and the formation of nations; without a remnant of the old civilisation, or any other rival to stir her energy; whilst the world assailed her from without and intrigued against her from within; many of her own, both clergy and laity, led on through human weakness by the lawless passions of their time; wealth lying at her feet tempting her to subside into the animal indolence which became the ruin of old Rome—in spite of all these she instilled into society those principles of human progress on which modern civilisation is founded. The seeds of all that is really great and enduring in our modern civilisation—the abolition of slavery, the Republics of Italy, and the *Magna Charta* of England, municipal liberties, commerce, distributive justice, hospitals, literature and art, agriculture, geographical discoveries, ancient literature guarded and saved—were then sown and cultivated, from generation to generation, when priests and monks had undisputed intellectual sway over the mind of Europe.

Modern times can show nothing to compare with the social work which Catholicism did in those times. Protestant nations started with the capital which Catholicism had made. No non-Catholic nation—neither of Protestantism which took its share and went its own way, like the Prodigal Son; nor of naturalism which is begotten of it, with the "pig philosophy" which it

picked up in its wanderings—has ever civilised itself from within, as the Christian Commonwealth of Europe arose from the bosom of the Catholic Church. How can any man, with such a history before him, think of doubting that the tendency of Catholicism is to human progress? No modern instances of national decadence can disprove the evidence of a thousand years. I am now neither admitting nor denying that decadence; but, in any case, the social structure which Catholicism had raised out of ruins and rubbish is a *fact* which should make us seek some other cause than Catholicism of that decadence.

I should occupy too much space if I treated this question exhaustively. But I can serve my purpose by a shorter method. I subjoin what some non-Catholic writers have written on the subject.

M. Augustus Thierry:—†

We have been far outstripped in the quest for public liberties by those burghers of the Middle Ages who rebuilt the walls and revived the civilisation of the old municipal cities.

M. Lavallée:—‡

The Monarchy of the Church was the commencement of liberty; it had nothing in it that was narrow or personal; it was the most illustrious triumph of intelligence over matter, and had the greatest influence over the popular movement that gave birth to the Communes and the Republics of the Middle Ages.

Lecky, having pointed out how the old civilisation had passed into complete dissolution, writes:—§

"At last the spirit of Christianity moved over this chaotic society, and not merely alleviated the evils that convulsed it, but also reorganised it on a new basis.

† *Lettres sur l'histoire de France*, page 13.

‡ *Hist. des Francais*, Tome I., liv. I., chap. 3.

§ *Rationalism in Europe*, vol. II., pages 234, 236, 237, 245, etc.

It did this in three ways: it abolished slavery, it created charity, it inculcated self-sacrifice.

"Other influences could produce the manumission of many slaves, but Christianity alone could effect the profound change of character that rendered possible the abolition of slavery. There are few subjects more striking, and at the same time more instructive, than the history of that great transition. The Christians did not preach a revolutionary doctrine. They did not proclaim slavery altogether unlawful, or, at least, not until the Bull of Pope Alexander III. in the 12th century, but they steadily sapped it at its basis by opposing to it the doctrine of universal brotherhood, and by infusing a spirit of humanity into all the relations of society. . . . In all the rites of religion the difference between bond and free was studiously ignored, and the clergy invariably proclaimed the act of enfranchisement to be meritorious. . . . But as long as the old antipathy to labour continued, nothing of any lasting value has been effected. But, here again the influence of the Church was exerted with unwavering beneficence and success. . . . At a time when religious enthusiasm was all directed towards the monastic life or towards the ideal of perfection, they made labour an essential part of their discipline. Wherever they went, they revived the traditions of old Roman agriculture, and large tracts of France and Belgium were drained and planted by their hands. . . . A monastery became the nucleus around which the inhabitants of the neighbourhood clustered. A town was thus gradually formed, civilised by Christian teaching, stimulated to industry by the example of the monks. At the same time the ornamentation of the Church gave the first impulse to art.

"By these means the contempt for labour which had been produced by slavery was corrected, and the path

was opened for the rise of the industrial classes which followed the Crusades. The ferocity of character that had preceded Christianity was combated with equal zeal, though not quite equal success, by the organization of Christian charity."

He shows at some length how the spirit of the Church took care of the sick and founded hospitals; "and for the first time the aureole of sanctity encircled the brow of sorrow and invested it with a mysterious charm." He then shows how the Church opposed the principle of self-sacrifice and individual freedom to selfishness and slavery, and thus created industry; but in the course of his exposition he has some things which are historically false, and some which I think are philosophically foolish.

Henry George, treating of the law of human progress, writes of the current evolutionary theory that "the practical outcome of this theory is a sort of hopeless fatalism, of which current literature is full;"(1) "that the obstacles which finally bring progress to a halt are raised by the course of progress; that what has destroyed all previous civilisations has been the conditions produced by the growth of civilisation itself."(2) Of the influence of the Catholic Church on human progress, he writes: "Two things happened of the utmost moment to incipient civilisation—the establishment of the Papacy, and the celibacy of the clergy. The first prevented the spiritual power from concentrating in the same lines as the temporal power; and the latter prevented the establishment of a priestly caste, during a time when all power tended to hereditary form. In her efforts for the abolition of slavery; in her Truce of God; in her monastic orders; in her councils which united nations, and her edicts which ran without regard

(1) *Progress and Poverty.* Book X., chap. I., page 431.
(2) Do. Do. Do. page 439.

to political boundaries; in the low-born hands in which she placed a sign before which the proudest knelt; in her bishops who by consecration became the peers of the greatest nobles; in her 'servant of servants,' for so his official title ran, who by virtue of the ring of a simple fisherman, claimed the right to arbitrate between nations, and whose stirrup was held by kings; the Church, in spite of everything, was yet a promoter of association, a witness for the natural equality of men; and by the Church herself was nurtured a spirit, when her early work of association and emancipation was well nigh done—when the ties she had knit had become strong, and the learning she had preserved had been given to the world—broke the chains with which she would have fettered the human mind, and in a great part of Europe rent her organization."(3). Elsewhere he writes: "The Church lands defrayed the cost of public worship and instruction, of the care of the sick and destitute." As a consequence he holds, with every dispassionate historian, that the confiscation of those lands from the Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation, was a robbery really committed on the poor.

Mr. Hyndman, the well-known English socialist, writes:—*

"Catholicism in its best period raised one continued protest against serfdom and usury, as early Christianity had denounced slavery and usury too."

In his *Historical Basis of Socialism in England*, he writes:—

"The relations of the Church, the monasteries, and

(3) *Loc. cit.*, page 470-471.—I have quoted Henry George as a Non-Catholic's testimony to the influence of the Church on civilization. Being a Non-Catholic, one should, of course, expect from him the opinion that she 'would have fettered the human mind.' At page 460-461, he bears even stronger testimony to her civilising influence.

* *Principles of Socialism.*

the clergy, to the people were most noteworthy from every point of view. There is nothing more noteworthy in the history of the human mind than the manner in which this essential portion of English society in the middle ages has been handled by the ordinary economists, chroniclers, and religionists. Even sober writers seem to loose their heads, or become afraid to tell the truth in this matter. Just as the modern capitalist can see nothing but anarchy and oppression in the connection between the people and the feudal nobles, so the authors who represent the middle class economy of our times, the Protestant divine whose creed is the devil take the hindmost here, and hereafter, fail to discover anything but luxury, debauchery, and hypocrisy in the Catholic Church of the 15th century. It is high time that, without any prejudice in favour of that Church, the nonsense which has been foisted on to the public by men interested in suppressing facts, should be exposed. It is not true that the Church of our ancestors was the organized fraud which it suits fanatics to represent it. It is not true that the monasteries, priories, and nunneries, were receptacles of all uncleanliness and lewdness; it is not true that the revenue of the celibate clergy and the celibate recluses were squandered in riotous living. . . . The Church, as all know, was the one body in which equality of conditions was the rule from the start. . . .

The lands of the Church were held in great part in trust for the people, whose absolute right to assistance when in sickness or poverty was never disputed. What useful, even noble functions, the priests and monks, friars and nuns, fulfilled in the middle-age economy has been stated in the last chapter. Universities, schools, roads, reception-houses, hospitals, poor-relief, all were maintained out of the Church funds. Even the retainers who were dismissed after the wars of the

Roses were in great part kept from actual starvation by the conventual establishment and by the parish priest. Not a word was heard against them in high quarters, barely a sputter of ridicule came up from the people against the Church, until Henry the VIII. wanted to form an adulterous, if not an incestuous marriage, in the first place, and to get possession of this vast property in order to fill his purse and bribe his favourites in the second.

As to the whole infamous plot from beginning to end, it is enough to say that the heroes of the business were Cranmer and Thomas Cromwell, the victims More and Fisher. The maner in which our middle-class history has been written is evidenced by the strenuous attempts to whitewash the pander and the rogue, and to belittle the philosopher and the patriot."

He then proceeds to trace the economic effects of what Sir Horace Plunkett calls this " simpler Christianity " which supplanted Catholicism in England. The property taken was appropriated by the King and his courtiers, and the poor were left to starve. After the Mortmain Laws and the spoliation of the Church we first hear of those English " valiant beggars and sturdy vagabonds " who roamed at large over the country till the people were taxed to support them through the Poor Law system, whilst the Pharisees whose "economic sense was shocked" by the " unproductive " Monasteries and Convents piously appropriated their lands out of which the poor used to be provided for, and schools, churches, and hospitals built and supported.

I may add another non-Catholic writer to the same effect, namely, Sir Horace himself. For, in spite of the repression of individuality, the shifting of the moral centre of gravity to another life, and other economic faults of which Catholicism is guilty, he says‡ that

‡ page 102.

—"Roman Catholicism has, at different periods of history, advantageously affected economic conditions . . . . and that, during the Middle Ages, when Roman Catholicism was freer than now to manifest its influence in many directions, owing to its practically unchallenged supremacy, it favoured, when it did not originate, many forms of sound economic activity, and was, to say the least, abreast of the time in its conception of the working of economic causes."

"But," he continues, "from the time when the Reformation by its demand for what we Protestants conceive to be a simpler Christianity, drove Catholicism back, if I may use the expression, on its first line of defence, and constrained it to look to its distinctively spiritual heritage, down to the present day, it has seemed to stand strangely aloof from any contact with industrial and economic issues."

Now, a Roman economist in the early days of Christianity might have said the same of the Church of that time. The business of the Church has been by its institution, and at all times to guard "its distinctively spiritual heritage," and it has always stood "strangely aloof from any contact with industrial and economic issues" unless in so far as these have fitted into the spiritual concerns of man, or have helped the march of human civilisation as a whole. Sir Horace Plunkett says that the "spiritual and economic ideals should be co-ordinated." What he plainly means by that is that Catholicism should modify its principles and practices in order to fit in with industrial and economic movements. I should rather say:—ignore man's spiritual interests, cast his soul and its concerns aside, as things not to be thought of; or else give them their due place in human life and action. If man's spiritual interests are to be considered at all, they must be immeasurably more important than his temporal interests which are bounded by

the present life. And if either is to be modified, in the process of co-ordination, for the sake of the other, interests which end in time should give way to those that are eternal. If there be a future life at all, we dare not, without stultifying ourselves, live irrespective of it, whether in our individual, social, religious, or commercial character. I, of course, admit the need of co-ordination; it stands to reason as well as to religion; and since the present life is a phase of human existence it must have its due place and attention. But Sir Horace's co-ordination is like that which the American discerned in the preacher's quotation from Isaiah: "and the wolf will lie down with the lamb"—"Yes; I guess the lamb will lie inside." But he greatly misrepresents the principles of Catholicism when he says that it "completely shifts the moral centre of gravity to a future existence." Like non-Catholics generally, and those nondescripts who have learned "Catholic" teaching in non-Catholic Colleges and go by the name of "Catholic," he can tell us more about our principles than we know ourselves. Why, since I learned my Penny Catechism, as a little boy, I have thought that it is sinful to neglect the daily duties of the present life. It is true, the Church does not say to us: "attend to your daily occupations, or you will lose money"; but, seeing a plain moral duty in the business of daily life, it says:—"If you seriously and habitually neglect your daily duties you will lose your soul."

But the direct purpose of the Church and that of the world are quite different. To use the words of Cardinal Newman:—

"The world believes in the world's ends as the greatest of goods; it wishes society to be governed simply and entirely for the sake of this world. Provided it could gain one little islet in the ocean, one foot upon the coast, if it could cheapen tea by sixpence

a pound, or make its flag respected among the Esquimaux or the Otaheitans, at the cost of a hundred lives and a hundred souls, it would think it a very good bargain."

On the other hand, the Church "considers the action of this world and the action of the soul as simply incommensurate, viewed in their respective spheres; she would rather save the soul of one single wild bandit of Calabria, or whining beggar of Palmero, than draw a hundred lines of railroad through the length and breadth of Italy, or carry out a sanitary reform, in its fullest details, in every city of Sicily, except so far as these great national works tended to some spiritual good beyond them. . . . If she encourages secular enterprises, studies, or pursuits, as she does, or the arts of civilisation generally, it is either from their indirect bearing upon her great object, or from the spontaneous energy which great ideas, such as hers, exert, and the irresistible influence which they exercise, in matters and in provinces not really their own."

And if we acknowledge the soul to be a substantial element of man's nature at all, and the future life to be a reality in man's existence, is not the philosophy of the Church the philosophy also of common sense? And is not the "economic sense" which is shocked by that philosophy, the plainest common nonsense? Philosophers of naturalism! tell me straight out that what I call my soul is only phosphorous, or merely the result of molecular forces; assure me that what I call my future life is only my fancy projected beyond the grave, and I will make short work of each by ignoring both. But if the former is a reality of my being, and the latter a reality in my existence, I must in consistency give them their due place. At the cost of dis-

* *Difficulties of Anglicans in Catholic Teaching*, pages 206, 211, 215.

gracing my reason as well as of damning my soul, I dare not tinker with their claims. It provokes one's common sense, almost irritates one's nerves, to hear of these awful things dealt with, trifled with, as if they were chattels of man's absolute ownership, which one may beg, borrow, buy, or steal, at one's pleasure. In the last analysis, naturalistic economics are reducible to mere gastronomics; the concerns of the soul and of the future life fall to the same level with the concerns of a creamery, the Vatican Council should have consulted the House of Commons, and the Synod of Maynooth should become a section of the Department.

It may be said to me that the moral and divine law, or the Catholic Church which I suppose to be their official interpreter, have nothing to do with politics or economics; I reply—with politics or economics as such, certainly not. But, may Parliament then justly revive the Penal Laws, make laws of distributive injustice, legalise a system of slavery by which human beings may be bought and sold and become the property of their purchaser? Is an economic system right which sanctions usury, or finds a place for trusts and monopolies which place the public at the mercy of a grinding industrialism? If not, why not? What is the criterion according to which they are wrong? Not surely the politics or the economics which sanction them. Then we must seek the source of their injustice in a higher law, namely, the moral and the divine, whose official interpreter is the Church of Christ. It will be asked, what has the Gospel of Christ to do with factories or the Stock Exchange? I reply, no more than a professor of mathematics has to do with the building of railway bridges, or a professor of chemistry with the sowing of potatoes or oats; and yet, let a railway bridge be built irrespective of the principles taught in mathematics, and it will be shattered and broken down

by the first goods train that passes over it; let potatoes or oats be sown in a soil not suited to them, and the crop will be a failure. In like manner, society, either in its political or economic action, cannot go on irrespective of the moral and divine law. It was tried in old Rome by the wisest and the ablest men the world has ever known, and we have seen what came of it. As Lecky pointed out, the Catholic Church simply taught the doctrines of the equality of men, the sacredness of marriage, the rights of woman, the spirit of sacrifice, the duty and dignity of labour—none of them directly economic, but all bound up with the mystery of the Incarnation—and selfishness, slavery, divorce, luxury, and the other social evils which began in naturalism and finally ruined Roman society, had no part in the new civilisation, as far as the Church could prevent it, or human passion yielded to its principles.

We must not identify human or social progress with mere material or industrial progress. They are quite separable, and are often found apart. They are neither necessarily opposed nor necessarily united. One is found without the other, for instance, in the millionaire who has no higher notion than making money, and he makes it; whose highest aspirations are on a level with the luxury which wealth can minister. Old Rome was in a state of national decadence at the time when its literature, art, and wealth were at their highest. A man may subdue the forces of nature and turn them to his use by the application of science, and when he has made himself most the master of matter may have become most its slave. It can be so with a nation also.

Human progress and civilisation then must not be identified with material progress; with gas, electricity, railroads and factories. "Not in bread alone doth man live." Progress is the natural growth and ripening of anything from its first germs or principles to its per-

fection. An oak grows from an acorn. A man develops, in size, symmetry, and strength, from infancy to manhood. But that is only physical progress; it is not human progress, for a man may grow muscular and fat and remain a fool. There is then intellectual progress, when his mind assimilates thoughts as his body assimilates food. But that is not all which is implied in human progress. What if a clever man uses his superior sharpness to cheat his neighbour and to live on his wits? We could not rightly call him a man of progress, or a type of civilised humanity, who habitually went to market or to the Stock Exchange, leaving his conscience at home with his prayer-book in the pocket of his Sunday coat; we should rather call him a "clever devil." What applies to the individual, applies to the family, to the nation, and to society at large.

Industrialism is not civilisation; industrial progress is undoubtedly both a law and a duty for a people, but it is not their highest law, nor their first duty.

> But sometimes virtue starves, while vice is fed,
> What then? Is the reward of virtue bread? *

I HAVE now pointed out the wide difference there is between human progress and mere material progress. To speak then of the progress of a people because of their industrial spirit or material prosperity is plainly to treat man as an animal *ad fruges consumere natus*. And the position is not improved even though the claims of intelligence be considered, if the intelligence is trained solely with a view to material progress; for in that case the mind is made a mere machine to minister to the appetites of sense. The soul becomes in practical life a function of matter, however spiritual be the philosophy we may follow in theory. Human progress or civilisation implies improvement and expansion in all the

* Pope.—Line 149-150.

elements which make up man's nature, in all the human interests of a people. The will and the heart are the great motive forces in human activity, and if due attention is not given to the proper cultivation of those, the attempt to build a truly prosperous nation is as vain as the task of the fool in the Gospel who tried to build his house on sand. The old Romans tried it, and they ended in miserable failure; and no people of to-day are more worldly wise than they were. By the most natural process they passed from comfort to wealth, from wealth to luxury, from luxury to indolence, from indolence to selfishness, and thence through "the survival of the fittest" to the distinction between the few masters who alone were citizens of the great Republic, and the multitudes who were their slaves and chattels.

It was the Catholic Church built up civilization again, and led men along the way of human progress.

I have already pointed out the mistake which Sir Horace Plunkett has made in representing the Catholic Church as "completely shifting the moral centre of gravity to the future existence." I now recall his argument, that its reliance on authority is an impediment to progress, inasmuch as it checks initiative and self-reliance.

If reliance on authority be a check to individual initiative and an obstacle to progress, how is progress possible at all? Authority is an essential element in every society. It is authority which gives unity and stability to society and is the safeguard of the liberty of its members. Society is the offspring of human intelligence and liberty. Civil authority unifies millions of individuals of different personal interests and passions, and makes them act with common national interest and purpose. It guards the rights and liberties of each, protecting each from the injustice or the despotism of the selfish and strong. Any society, from a municipal corporation

to a nation, is simply inconceivable without an authority to rule it. Authority, so far from lessening individual liberty was conceived by human intelligence and established by human liberty for its own safeguard; and thus it is not an obstacle, but a help to initiative, and is a necessary condition of human progress. If anyone complain that his liberty is restricted in not being allowed to invade the rights of others, he has to explain how he came by the right to invade their rights and thus to restrict the liberty of his neighbour. For his complaint implies simply that others have no rights or liberties in the presence of his, that he has unlimited liberty, and even the right to do wrong. We thus alight on the difference on the one hand between authority which secures liberty and despotism which restrains it; and on the other hand, the difference between liberty which is the birthright of everybody, and license—the abuse of liberty—which is the right of nobody. The truth is, authority and liberty are two phases of one and the same principle.

Sir Horace will remind me that he was not speaking of civil, but of religious authority. But, then, how is it that authority which secures individual liberty in the State, restrains it in the Church? Authority is the safeguard of liberty also in religion, he will reply, except in the Catholic Church. It is reliance on that authority which "represses individuality," "checks the growth of the qualities of initiative and self-reliance," and is for that reason an impediment to progress. But how would he explain, then, the genesis of liberty, the impulse to enterprise, the birth, growth, and the vast strides of human progress which began at the dawn of the Middle Ages, when there was no power but Catholicism to create them, and whilst it was in the power of the Catholic Church to check their growth or to nip them in the bud if

it chose? And Guizot,* together with every non-Catholic historian of name, admits that human progress in all its phases was then protected and promoted by the Catholic Church. Sir Horace saves me the trouble of more quotation, for he himself admits it all; and yet he denies the possibility in principle of what he admits has happened in fact.

Every Catholic knows, unless those "Catholics" who are outside everything Catholic except the name, that he is as free as air in all his political and economic, in his temporal activities and relations of all sorts, as long as he does not run counter to the teaching or discipline of that Church which he believes to have been instituted by Christ to expound the moral and divine Law, and to guard their observance by the necessary discipline of life. And the doctrine and discipline of the Catholic Church gives every member of it plenty of scope for all the economic activity he wishes to put forth. I know that Catholics may not lawfully believe or do some things as to which non-Catholics enjoy untrammelled scope for thought and action. But, if those things are false it is not liberty of thought to assent to them; if those things are wrong it is not liberty of action to do them. It is not liberty of thought or of action, but license in both, that lets a man think what is false and do what is wrong. If I do my neighbour an injustice I do not use my liberty; I abuse it. It is an act, not of liberty, but of license. In truth, there is no such thing in nature as free-thought. It is a chimera; a crude expression without a meaning.

Authority in society is for the sake of and is the safeguard of the liberty of the subject. But what is the safeguard of authority? Force may make it feared; only re-

* *Histoire gènerale de la Civilisation en Europe.* 2ieme, 3ieme, 5ieme Leçon.—In this last place (page 132, 3rd Edition, 1840), he says: "Her influence on modern civilisation has been immense, greater perhaps than has ever been imagined by her most ardent adversaries or her most zealous advocates." Milman, Hallam, and others bear similar testimony.

ligion inspires the sense of duty which respects it. But it must be a religion which does not owe its power to the individuals whom it is supposed to guide. If it depends on the people to determine what doctrines it shall teach, what discipline it shall order, it is only a religion of their own making which they may shape or discard at their will. Made by the people they can unmake it with equal right; it is a function of the State; nothing more than the concrete manifestation of what happens to be the trend of public opinion for the time being. To subject oneself to a religion of human manufacture like that is to bear a yoke of religious despotism which a people can never venerate, and which they will not long endure at an inconvenience. Well, that is Protestantism precisely; for it assumes that God has ordered a religion; but instead of having to take charge of anybody, everybody has to take charge of it. Protestantism is essentially of home manufacture; each person makes his own according to his conviction or fancy. I apprehend that Sir Horace Plunkett will not approve that exposition of it. I set it forth as what I think to be a plain corollary from what he will of course avow. Because Protestantism was inaugurated on the supposition that Catholicism had grown so corrupt that the Church of Christ had long ceased to be. But they assumed that individuals may succeed where a whole Church failed, and each one thought himself commissioned by God to construct the real article at least for his own use.

The Reformers, therefore, considered religion as a thing which was not to teach or to take care of them, but as a thing to be taught and taken care of by them. I will be reminded that Protestants are bound by the Thirty-nine Articles; but I remind whoever reminds me that if I were a Protestant I would, on the principle of my divine right of private judgment, resent the impertinence of any person or

institution that would ask me to subscribe to any number of them more or less than I thought well to accept. May not Parliament in the morning change the number to thirty-eight? May not any Member bring in a bill to enlarge or lessen their number, or to modify them, side by side with a bill to fix a duty on tea or tobacco? It may be said that I am now casting ridicule; it may be ridicule, but it is reason. Nay, it is fact. The Act of Union decreed that in future the Protestant Church in Ireland should hold the same articles of belief as the Protestant Church in England. The 5th Article of the Act provided "that the Churches of England and Ireland, as now by law established, be united into one Protestant Episcopal Church, to be called the United Church of England and Ireland; and that the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government of the said United Church shall be, and shall remain in full force for ever, as the same one now by law established for the Church of England." However, they did not remain *the same for ever*, but only for 70 years; for in 1871 the chief legislative power in the Irish Protestant Church was transferred to a General Synod consisting of clergy and laity in Ireland, who, in spite of the natural variations of private judgment, as if by the inspiration of a *Deus ex machina*, have happened upon the usual creed of thirty-nine articles and other formularies, "subject to such alterations only as may be made therein from time to time by the lawful authority of the Church." * I have no intention to make Protestantism look ridiculous; my purpose is to make plain that it is part and parcel of the State; pure naturalism in principle. It is simply the conviction, feeling, or fancy which actuates each individual for the time being. In other words, it leaves each one in the condition in which it found him; it gives a glow to noble instincts if

* *The Constitution of the Church of Ireland.*—Preamble and Declaration, adopted by the General Convention in the year 1870.

he happen to have such; it bends to baser passions if such be his; in a word, it satisfies his selfishness, whatever form his selfishness assumes.

Such is Protestantism in principle; let us see what it is in practice. We have seen on the avowal of non-Catholic writers, what Catholicism did in the ages of faith. Protestantism began its work with the accumulated capital of civilisation which Catholicism had created; nevertheless, during the three centuries of its existence, it has not Christianized or civilised a single barbarian or pagan people. Let us take England as a type. What is the result of the civilising influence of English rule in India? That influence began in the middle of the 18th century, when the Mogul power had been crushed by Clive. How did it set about civilising the natives? They were subjected to a systematic oppression, under the name of government, which is one of the blackest blots on the pages of human history. They, as well as their country, which they no longer dared to call their own, were made mere instruments of wealth for the relays of English adventurers who went there to make money and came home when they had it made. Burke thus painted in Parliament the barbarity practised on the natives: "If we were driven out of India this day, nothing would remain to tell that it had been possessed, during the inglorious period of our dominion, by any better than the ourang-outang and the tiger." And what has been the history of English civilisation there since Burke's day? Periodical and frequent famines, during each of which multitudes are swept away, whilst the country yields immense resources to England, and they have to support an enormous native army to hold themselves in subjection. And have their rulers tried to Christianize them? Protestantism has been more occupied in preying on them than in praying for them. England pretended to extend the Gospel, but it merely meant

to extend its trade. It is the economics of commercial progress, I admit. Whilst Protestantism was forcing itself down our throats here in Ireland, it let the Hindoos hug their idols and worship their gods, provided they peacefully gave up their treasures, and paid the taxes imposed on them. We find the "economic sense" asserting itself also in this fact, that Protestantism had held sway over India for more than half-a-century before it thought of building a church for itself.

Let us pass to Australasia, and a similar history meets us A century and a-half ago, Australia, New Zealand, and Tasmania, were inhabited solely by barbarian natives. It was a fruitful field from which a rich harvest of civilisation and Christianity might have been reaped. Protestantism had the field to itself; because Catholic influence, for good or evil, was for long kept away by the Penal Laws. How did it civilise the natives? By a simple process—it exterminated them. They were chased to death as the beasts that roamed through their forests; they were betrayed and butchered, and that under protection of government. In twenty years the Tasmanians were extinguished; the Australians are almost gone; and the Maories of New Zealand, whose bravery and natural ability deserve a better fate, are fast disappearing.

The same method of civilisation has done its work on those native tribes of Africa whose natural right to live where they got life English Protestantism found obstructing the march of its industrial progress. And here I am reminded to ask:—which shows more proof of human civilisation, the honest industry, the frugal comfort, the heroic bravery of the Boers, or the aggressiveness of British commercialism which only, from a confusion of ideas and by a misuse of words, could be called human progress? It may be called material progress.

The North American Colonies tell a similar story. Bancroft, the Protestant historian of the United States,

tells us that there was universal liberty, civil and religious, in the Catholic colony of Maryland, whilst Protestantism proscribed every other form of religion than itself in those colonies where it held sway. It became the first asylum in America for the oppressed of every creed and of every land. Protestants fled there from the New England States, driven out by the bigotry of the Puritans; and when they grew strong in number they revolted against that Catholic constitution which had sheltered them; and when the rebellion was put down, the General Assembly of Maryland, ignoring the ingratitude and the bigotry of the rebels, passed a law securing liberty of conscience to everyone who came within its frontier. After the English power had supplanted the French in North America, Bancroft says that "influence by commerce took the place of influence by religion, and English trading houses supplanted French missions." And how did that influence exert itself on the fortunes of the natives? We shall see from the following law which was passed in Massachusetts in 1675:—"Ordered by the Court, that whosoever shall shoot off any gun on any unnecessary occasion, on any game whatever, except an Indian or a wolf, shall forfeit five shillings for every such shot, till further liberty shall be given." And, according to Bancroft, a reward of £15 was offered for an Indian's scalp, which was afterwards increased to £100. I admit that those were economic laws made, and economic money spent, since they threw aside obstacles to the march of material progress. I do not dispute that; I merely deny that it was human progress. The grim brutality of those laws and bounties reveal what is the natural outcome of that industrial progress which naturalistic economics provide for. The influence of the "simpler Christianity" marched the Indians, tribe by tribe, not from the primitive shelter of their wigwams to the ways of civilised life, but to slavery, chains, and ex-

termination. And the wigwam of the Indian fared no worse, far better, than the cottage of the Acadian farmer.

Let us consider by contrast the colonies of Spain. The native races of North America are gone; those of South America remain to this day. The natives of the English cclonies were exterminated, not civilised; the natives of the Spanish colonies were civilised, not exterminated. How did the Spaniards deal with the natives of the Philippines? They were not exterminated at any rate, as the present population of those Islands shows. Of what the Spaniards have done to civilise them I call to witness the University of Manilla which was founded so early as 1611 and has six Faculties, and about 2,000 students; I call to witness the Colleges for Secondary Education which are attended by over 8,000 students; I call to witness the 2,167 Primary Schools. To colonise a country, in the true sense of the term, is not to work it for the exclusive benefit of the colonisers and to the detriment or the destruction of the aborigines, but to bring to these and to diffuse over their country the civilisation which the colonisers already enjoy. In that sense the Spaniards and the Portuguese stand out in clear contrast to the English and the Dutch. Mr. Crawford, Governor of Singapore, said at a meeting of Protestant missionaries—"In the Philippine Islands alone the Spaniards converted several millions of natives, and therefrom resulted an enormous amelioration of their social condition." * Sir Henry Ellis praises the Spaniards for the foundation of schools throughout the whole of the colony. † Sir John Browning wrote in 1859:—"The Catholic clergy exercise an influence which would appear magical, if it were not regarded by partisans as divine." And again:—"The inhabitants of Manilla, serving on board their vessels, are generally able to sign their names, which is very often

* *The Times*, Dec. 2nd, 1858.
† *Journal of an Embassy to China*. Chap. VIII., page 442.

not the case with the English sailors in the Philippine Islands. There are very few Indians who do not know how to read, and this satisfactory result has been obtained in a country entirely given up to the dominion of the clergy and colonised by Spaniards, in a country without an education league and without any form of compulsory instruction."‡ And yet, America pretends that its purpose in supplanting the Spanish power in the Philippines was to civilise the natives!

A writer in the New York *Sun* quotes the following from the "Hispano-American Encyclopedia" as to the state of education in the Philippines:—

"In 1889 there were 870 schools for boys and 749 for girls in the island, with an average attendance of 154,000 children. There is a splendid University—St. Thomas's—established in 1619, an academy for girls dating from 1696, and several other chartered colleges where the most advanced branches of learning are taught."

The Hon. John Barrett, the American Minister to Siam, wrote on the same subject in the *North American Review* in 1879:—

"Charity and benevolence are represented in hospitals, homes, and asylums; education by colleges, schools of law, theology, medicine, pharmacy, and manual training; fine arts and science by museums, rare collections, and observatories; manufacturing by immense cigar, cigarette, and rope factories."

On the same, Mr. W. B. Palgrave writes in the "Scientific American Supplement":—"As a social bond, a harmonising influence, a promoter of friendly intercourse, of right, of love even; a balm—ideal, but not inefficacious—for the wounds and bruises of fact, Christianity has, it would seem, rarely been more advantageous to its followers than here."

‡ Taken from Baron de Haulleville's *Social Aspects of Catholicism and Protestantism*. Translated by Sir Henry Bellingham.

Far different has been the fate of the aborigines of Australia under England. Even at this day the atrocities practised on those of them who remain is almost unspeakable. In support of which I have the authority of Dr. Gibney, Catholic Bishop of West Australia, who has been a witness to them for a generation, and has often denounced them to the Government authorities in vain. I have also the authority of Mr. Malcolmson, and of Dr. Rentoul, a Professor in the Presbyterian College of Melbourne.

But, England and America have advanced themselves to a high state of civilisation, at any rate? We shall see, and perhaps our conclusions will be a little startling.

CHAPTER IV.

THE SOCIAL ECONOMICS OF ENGLAND.

In pre-Reformation times in England, according to the Anglican Bishop Stubbs, "every man or woman, of what state or condition that he may be, shall be free to set their son or daughter to take learning at any school that pleaseth them within the realm." That provision for popular education applied to the serfs as well as to their masters.

Prof. Thorold Rogers,* writing of the time before the Black Death, says that:—

"The means of life were as plentiful, considering the population, in the 13th century, as they were in the 18th; the continuity of labour was secured, and the prospects of those who lived by manual labour was good. The age had its drawbacks, as every age has; but it had its advantages; and I hope to be able to show that the peasant of the 13th century, though he did not possess, and therefore did not desire, much that his descendant had in the 18th, had some solid elements of present advantage, and not a few hopes of future advancement." And again:—†

"There can be no doubt that in the 13th century, every peasant had his pig in his sty. It is more certain that he had his fowl in the pot. Poultry-keeping was universal."

In the pre-Reformation times every working-man with a family had a house and land; in England, about four

* *Six Centuries of Work and Wages*, page 69.
† *Loc. cit.*, page 83.

acres; in France, about six acres; in Germany, about the same as in England. He had one or more cows, some pigs, and poultry of every kind. They had, moreover, the right of pasturage for their cattle on the commons, and for their pigs in the woods. A mason of the 15th century earned about sixpence a day; which was equal to about six shillings a day at the present time, and its purchasing power as to house-rent, food, and clothing was several times more than it is to-day. We can get a good idea of the value of workmen's wages in the 15th century from what Thorold Rogers writes at page 389 of his book:—

"The price of wheat in 1495 was $4\frac{3}{4}$ shillings a quarter, or eight bushels; of malt, 2s. $4\frac{1}{2}$d.; and of oatmeal 5s. $4\frac{1}{2}$d. a quarter. . . . In so cheap a year as this the peasant could provision his family for a twelvemonth with three quarters of wheat, three of malt, and two of oatmeal, by fifteen weeks of individual work; an artisan could achieve the same in ten weeks. Such wages were regularly paid, and even more, particularly in London."

Mr. Hyndman tells us that, from extant account-books of the monasteries, it has become known how large a share of their revenues was spent on the poor, the sick, and other works of charity; and he says:—

"Granting that large sums were wasted on the useless ceremonies of Masses and candles, that some of the monasteries had a well-managed refectory and an admirable cellar of wine and beer, it is certain, nevertheless, that the abbots and priors were the best landlords in England, and that so long as the Church held its lands and its power, *permanent pauperism was unknown.*"

Those are strong words; for whilst Mr. Hyndman's disposition may be shocked at having money wasted

‡ *Historical Basis of Socialism*, pages 16 and 17.

on "the useless ceremonies of Masses and candles" —and it is due to him to observe that he only grants, but does not assert that it was waste—he holds it as certain that in those days of which he writes, "permanent pauperism was unknown" in England. Now, I think that the true test of sound social economy is, not the formation of centres of accumulated wealth, but the absence of permanent pauperism. There must be something out of gear, or something wanting, in any system of economics which, however it may stimulate the industrial spirit or multiply spinning-jennies, produces a few millionaires and a million paupers. It is not a law of nature that any man should be a Croesus, but it is a law of nature that no man should starve. Let us take a parish of a thousand families; would anyone call that parish wealthy because a dozen families could afford the luxury of a motor-car, if five hundred others could only keep an ass and the rest could barely keep body and soul together?

Looking over, not a few years, but over generations brought up with the "individuality" and with "those qualities of initiative and self-reliance" which we are told that Protestantism promotes, can it be said that the advancement of national prosperity in England has been the result of the Reformation? In forming our judgment we must keep in mind that the England of to-day is heir to the national traditions of those Catholic times when "permanent pauperism was unknown." Many generations must pass before the inherited tendencies of a people cease to influence them. When England threw off Catholicism, she was in the prime of her national life, and in the natural course of things she should go on living and thriving, just as a man with a well-built constitution will retain his health for a long time in spite of indolence, vice, or luxurious living. A man does not lose every virtue, because he has lost his

faith; neither does a nation. One controlling vice might have brought about the loss of faith, but the man who has lost it may remain as energetic, as industrious, or as benevolent as before. Avarice may keep a man industrious and thrifty; selfishness may be the source of self-restraint and courtesy; personal ambition or vanity may be at the bottom of the benevolence which one displays. It does not follow that a man would trouble about those natural virtues for the sake of a higher principle from the fact that he carefully cultivates them for the sake of personal advancement. The virtues of such a man are mere commercial assets; behind the energy, the self-restraint, the courtesy, the truthfulness, the benevolence is simply self in some form or other. Such a man is sure to make money; and such a people will achieve material prosperity. Why not? But the individualism which begins in self will also end in self. The egoism of initiative and self-reliance will end in the survival of the fittest, will in the long run disregard the interests of the many who are down unless as levers to elevate still more the few who are up. But will that man's money make his happiness? Can that nation stand?

Those thoughts have come to me from reading a book lately written on "The Effects of the Factory System,"* by Allen Clarke. He writes:—

"To-day men are of less consequence than machines; they are the servants of machines. The machine, in its wonderful development, has become almost human; while man has been reduced, as far as possible, to the condition of a machine. . . . Not that machinery in itself was, or is, such a bad thing; its curse lay in its being the property of capitalists who soon realised what vast fortunes they could capture by its use. . . . Iron,

* Pages 1, 2, 3.

ingeniously fashioned into a giant's body, with a venous system of steam, leathern muscles called straps, and Mammon for soul or guiding power, became a monster that snatched hand-workers from their homes, dragged them to one of its dungeons, and said—here you shall be my slaves, or starve. . . . Though the iron demon has made luxury for the few he has made poverty and crime and feelings of rebellion for the many; and out of these two things—fat tyranny on the one hand and lean slavery on the other—no good can come, but only evil."

In 1779 Crompton invented the spinning-mule; and six years later steam was first used as a motive power instead of water. In 1786 the largest spinning-mule in Bolton had 108 spindles; to-day some of those machines have 1,200 spindles. That shows the mechanical progress made within a hundred years. Then came the age of machinery and steam; villages grew into large manufacturing towns; homes of industry were supplanted by factories; and from the factory system and the expansion of commerce has come our modern economics, and our "economic sense."

During the last years of the 18th and early years of the 19th century, whilst the Continent became an international cock-pit, industries were expanding in England; she was spinning and weaving for those who had no time to spin or weave for themselves. Thus has her industrial greatness arisen from the combination of a number of circumstances. Like an avaricious man who begins to seek wealth for the sake of his happiness, and ends by forgetting or sacrificing his happiness for the sake of wealth, the industrial spirit in England worked itself out at a terrible cost. This is how Gibbins tells the story*:—

"The manufacturers wanted labour by some means or other, and they got it. They got it from workhouses.

† *Industrial History of England*, page 178-181.

The mill-owners systematically communicated with the overseers of the poor, who arranged a day for the inspection of pauper children. Those chosen were conveyed by wagons or canal boats to their destination, and from that moment were doomed to slavery. Sometimes regular traffickers would take the place of the manufacturer, and transfer a number of children to a factory district, and there keep them, generally in some dark cellar, till they could hand them over to the mill-owner in want of hands, who would come and examine their height, strength, and bodily capacities, exactly as did the slave dealers in the American markets. After that the children were simply at the mercy of their owners, nominally as apprentices, but in reality as mere slaves, who got no wages, and whom it was not worth while to feed or clothe properly, because they were so cheap, and their places could be so easily supplied. It was often arranged by the parish authorities, in order to get rid of imbeciles that one idiot should be taken by the mill-owner with every twenty sane children. The fate of those idiots has never been disclosed. The treatment of the 'apprentices' was most inhuman; the hours of their labour were only limited by exhaustion after many modes of torture had been unavailingly applied to force continued wrok. Sunday was spent cleaning machinery. They were fed on the coarsest food, often with the same as that served out to the pigs of their master. They slept by turns, in relays, in filthy beds. There was often no discrimination of sexes; and disease, misery, and vice, grew as in a hotbed of contagion. To prevent them from escaping, some had irons riveted on their ankles, with long links reaching to their hips,and were compelled to work and sleep in these chains, young women and girls as well as boys suffering this brutal treatment. During

this period of unheeded and ghastly suffering in the mills of our native land, the British philanthropist was occupying himself with agitating for the relief of the very largely imaginary woes of negro slaves in other countries. The spectacle of England buying the freedom of black slaves by riches drawn from the labour of white ones, affords an interesting study for the cynical philosopher."

In 1833 the black slave trade was abolished; but in that same year Southey, the Poet Laureate, wrote that "the slave trade is mercy compared with the factory system."

According to Clarke, 528,795 persons (of whom 320,000 are females) get employment from the cotton trade of England, whilst 655,636 are employed in factories of all other kinds of textile industry. We may take the cotton trade, then, as typical of English factories; and Bolton and Oldham are its two great centres. A century ago Bolton had a population of only a few thousand; its population is now over 125,000. The increase of population is owing to the cotton industry; and as the cotton industry has increased its inhabitants, it must support them, or they starve. They entirely depend upon it; and I am told that last winter, owing to the decline in trade, thousands of them were in a state of absolute want. But taking it at its best, what has it done for civilisation in Lancashire? The death-rate in Bolton is 36 to 1,000; the average death-rate of Lancashire is 10 to 1,000. A sign of the precarious health of the inhabitants is, that quack doctors do a roaring trade in herbs, patent medicines, and pills. Clarke tells us, and he writes from personal knowledge, that beneath the labouring class there is a fourth class of people in Bolton who when they die are not buried in graves, as we understand it, but are dumped into a

common pit. As to the effect of the factory system on morality, he says* that—

"There is alive to-day (or was not long ago) not far from Manchester, an employer who makes seduction one of the conditions on which females may have work at his establishment. If they decline they must quit. Single or married makes no difference, and the same rule applies to the girl of sixteen and the woman of thirty. How many victims have fallen to this gentleman it would be difficult to estimate, but he has been enforcing this game for many, many years. There are many employers like him; I knew two or three myself some years ago."

And again, he writes*—

"I am reluctant to write it, but it is a sad fact, that the majority of parents in Lancashire regard children only as commercial speculations, to be turned into wage-earning machines as soon as the child's age and the law will permit. For this they oppose the raising of the age of half-timers; for this they resent all legislative interference, either educational or hygienic, in the matter of their children. If the children could only hold a congress, and speak, what shameful revelations would be made. No wild beast ever treats its young as too many of the fathers and mothers of Lancashire have treated and still treat theirs. I write in all sorrow, for I am a Lancashire lad myself. A lion, a bear, or even the basest of brutes, will fight to the death to protect their young; but a great many human beings in Lancashire—and elsewhere—are eager to turn their young to the most advantage by sacrificing them on the altar of trade for paltry pecuniary gain."

It is all very well to write rhetoric about the hum of industry, busy centres of trade, "individuality," "initia-

* Page 83.
† Page 105.

tive," "self-reliance," "civic virtues and efficiencies," but after what I have quoted from Clarke, a man who went through the mill himself in metaphor and in fact, can we say that the state of things which we learn from him is a sign of civilisation? I think I have justified the distinction I have drawn between mere material progress and human progress.

But there is more to be considered. With the rise of the factory system began the decline of agriculture in England. Wealth could be more expeditiously made by manufacture than by agriculture. England gave up its corn and meadows for cotton and machinery, because capitalists found these the shortest way to wealth; and hence it is turning into so many festering sores as there are manufacturing cities, whilst the country is deserted. In 1851 there were 1,253,800 agricultural labourers in England; in 1881 there were 870,800; and in 1891, the number had decreased to 780,000. To-day they number about 700,000. And will the cotton industry continue to support the populous cities it has created? The decline in the export and the increase in the import of cotton goods seem to say—no. In 1881 cotton goods to the value of £58,404,212 were exported; in 1893 cotton goods were exported to the value of £47,281,114. On the other hand, in 1883 cotton goods to the value of £520,897 were imported; in 1896 the value of those imports was £1,040,748. Moreover, whilst the cotton trade is on the decline, or at least at a stand still in England, it is growing fast in India, China, Japan, Mexico, Egypt, on the Continent, and in America. And when the cotton industry decays, how will it be with the teeming populations of such places as Oldham and Bolton? The civilization which has brought them along riding on the tide of material progress will leave them struggling in the mire when the tide has gone out. That "simpler Christianity" which has taught them to

"develop the qualities which make for well-being in this life" will not help them much at any rate, since out of a population of about 125,000 in Bolton, about 14,000 go to any place of worship. And these are the economics to which we are counselled to co-ordinate our spiritual ideals!

And even on the score of material prosperity what has England gained? I find in a book recently published * that 27·84 per cent. of the people of York are living in poverty, *i.e.*, whose earnings are either insufficient, or barely sufficient, for the maintenance of merely physical efficiency. According to Mr. Charles Booth,† 30·7 per cent. of the inhabitants of London are in a similar condition.

I have taken the following cutting from a London newspaper:—

"During the last week in January twenty officials of the London County Council searched the streets for the homeless. The area covered extended from Hyde Park on the West to Whitechapel on the east. The northern boundary was High Holborn, Old Street, and Bethnal Green Road; the southern margin, the Thames. This is what they found:—1,463 men, 116 women, 46 boys, and 4 girls walking the streets; 100 males and 68 females asleep on stair-cases, in doorways, and under archways; in all, 1,797 homeless persons. The searchers estimated that one in every 2,000 persons was homeless on that particular night."

Charles E. Lester, an American traveller, in his work, "The Glory and Shame of England," speaking of "infant and female slaves in the English coal-mines," says that "slavery in its most hideous form never equalled this, and the condition, physical as well as moral, of the most degraded bondsman may be esteemed exalted if

*Poverty: A Study of Town Life: by B. Seebohm Rowntree. Chap. IV.

†*Life and Labour of the People in London.*

compared with that of a free collier in England.* And he quotes, as follows, the comments of a London paper on a report laid before Parliament:—

"The infernal cruelties practised upon boys and girls in the coal mines, those graves of comfort and virtue, have never in any age been outdone. We have sometimes read, with shuddering disgust, of the outrages committed upon helpless childhood by man when existing in a state of naked savageness. We aver our belief, that in cold-blooded atrocity they do not equal what is going on from day to day in some of our coal mines."

Mr. Chamberlain wrote in 1883†—

"Never before in our history were wealth and the evidences of wealth more abundant; never before was luxurious living so general and so wanton in its display, and never before was the misery of the poor more intense, or the conditions of their daily life more hopeless or more degraded. . . . England has a million paupers and millions more are on the verge of it."

The natural purpose of a man's industry and effort is the comfort and happiness of himself and his family. To sacrifice happiness for the making of money is as unnatural as if one gave himself no time for dinner in his eagerness to earn more than the price of it. What is the meaning of earning the price of a dinner, unless one buys and eats it? The same principle applies to a people. National prosperity, the happiness of a people, is the purpose of social economics, and the natural end of their industry. That political economy which makes millionaires of a few and begets misery for the multitude must have the germs of corruption concealed in it somewhere. The industrial spirit which sacrifices every other human interest on the altar of Mammon is unnatural,

*Vol. II., page 339.
†*Fortnightly Review*, December, 1883.

and the sooner a nation is exorcised of it the better. Material prosperity, simply accumulated wealth in a country, is not the true end of national industry. Social economics imply distribution as well as accumulation. The material prosperity in a nation does not then imply national prosperity. The best test of national prosperity is the happiness of the people taken as a whole.

Now, Mr. Lester, from whom I have already quoted, writes*:—"It has been well said by an Englishman himself that to talk of English happiness is like talking of Spartan freedom—the helots are overlooked." Quite true. We stand on the quays of Liverpool and look along miles of merchant ships; we see a similar sign of commercial greatness if we visit London docks. Flying through the country in a train we see the manifestation of prosperity and a settled civilisation everywhere—stately mansions, broad demesnes, farm-houses and cottages nestling in comfort; in the cities and towns, forests of factory chimneys which tell us of industrial activity, and splendid West-End mansions where landowners, mill-owners, iron-masters, etc., try to spend as much as they can of the rental of their estates or of the profits of their industries during the winter season, unless they go abroad. That is the sunshine; but we must not forget the shadow. We must see the slums where the workers live as well as the mansions of the capitalists who employ them; we must learn the conditions of the miners who delve out the wealth, as well as the state of those who roll in it. It is necessary to know if ignorance, vice, vulgarity, human misery of every kind, be not hidden away, be not festering behind the outer coating of external culture, prosperity and happiness that we see. If one spoke of the people to a Spartan he would not think he was asked about the helots; if one asked even the noblest philosopher of pagan Rome for

*Vol. I,. page 141.

a census of the citizens he would no more think of counting in the slaves than he would think of the horses, carts, or cows. Christianity changed all that; for, according to Christian principles, there was to be no distinction between bond and free; and I remember to have seen that idea beautifully brought out in the letters of Sir Thomas More, in which, when away from home, he used to ask about the servants as well as about his own children. According to his enlightened Catholic idea they were all members of his family. In English the word *family* now excludes the servants; whilst in Spanish and Italian it includes the servants, who are considered to be members of the family, as they were in England in Catholic times. Thus the Catholic doctrine of the equality and brotherhood of man is enshrined in the language of Catholic nations, living at least as a memorial of the consistent conduct of our fathers. That instinct is alive in Catholic Ireland to-day, unless where and in so far as we have become Anglicised.

I have already drawn attention to the shade of the social picture in modern England. Let us have another look; I have allowed, and I will allow no Catholic writer to paint it. Fifty years ago, Joseph Kay, commissioned by the University of Cambridge, drew such a picture of the poor in England, in his *Social Condition and Education of the English People*, that the Statistical Society of London, aghast at his disclosures, formed a committee of enquiry into the matter, and the following is one extract from their history of horrors:—

"Your Committee have thus given a picture in detail of human wretchedness, filth, and brutal degradation, the chief features of which are a disgrace to a civilized country, and which your Committee have reason to fear, from letters which have appeared in the public journals, is but a type of the miserable condition of masses of the community, whether located in the small, ill-ventilated

rooms of the manufacturing towns or in many of the cottages of the agricultural peasantry. In these wretched dwellings all ages and all sexes—fathers and daughters, mothers and sons, grown-up brothers and sisters, stranger adult males and females, and swarms of children—the sick, the dying, and the dead, all herded together with proximity and mutual pressure which brutes would resist; where it is physically impossible to preserve the ordinary decencies of life; where all sense of propriety and self-respect must be lost."

In 1848, Aubrey de Vere, in a series of letters* which he addressed to an English Member of Parliament,, wrote the following. That was before he became a Catholic:—

"You inveigh, Sir, against the squalidness of many an Irish village; have you read the report of a Commission which was instituted not long ago to inquire into the state of certain English mining districts? If it does not recount fables, your mines contained not long since, a degree of misery and a peculiar species of degradation, whereof we in this country know nothing. Amongst us, women have never toiled in the attitude of beasts, amid slimy caverns, and surrounded by a savage race, naked, blasphemous and brutal. In this country, children of twelve years old are not to be found who do not know the name of their country or their sovereign. Whether these atrocities have since been amended, I know not; but they existed two years ago; nor can aught else so pointedly illustrate the degradation that had sunk through the social into the moral being, as the fact, that when the Legislature found it necessary to interfere, and, supplying the

* *English Misrule and Irish Misdeeds*, pages 197, 198, 199. It is a work which is now little known; yet I think that no work of so high an order has been written on Irish affairs since Edmund Burke wrote.

place of morals with laws, to protect womanhood and in it humanity itself from outrage, those unfortunates raised up from the depths and remanded to their native air but to die, bewildered and helpless, staggering between contending claims, for their own sake and that of their starving children, petitioned to be indulged again in what was there accounted but freedom of labour. You are offended at the cottiered and foodless wastes of Kerry; have you ever visited the alleys of your manufacturing districts Have you ever read any of the Parliamentary Reports on that subject? . . . In Irish hovels you meet with a worship which you condemn; it is in English manufacturing districts that you are confronted by multitudes who have never heard of the existence of a God, or named that name at which the nations bow."

But that is of the distant past; and have things improved since then? In some respects and to some extent, that is true; but let us follow the process of social evolution there. In 1876, Lester wrote in the work already quoted*:—"The ignorance, vice, disease, deformity, and wretchedness of the English operatives as a body almost exceed belief. I am persuaded the physical miseries of the English operatives are greater by far than the West Indian slaves suffered before their emancipation. They are too ignorant to understand their rights, and too weak to assert them." In January, 1880, the Protestant bishop of Rochester wrote, in *Good Words*:—"I lament that dense, and coarse, and almost brutal ignorance in which the toiling masses of the people who have outgrown the Church's grasp are permitted to live and die, of all that touches their salvation and explains their destiny. To hundreds of thousands of our fellow-countrymen Almighty God is practically an unknown Being, except as the substance of a hideous oath; Jesus

* Page 161.

Christ, in His redeeming love and human sympathy, as distant as a fixed star."

Now, a few words of digression—The English people have been luxuriating in the license of the "simpler Christianity" for three centuries. Last March they celebrated the centenary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, which boasts of having published the Word of God in 350 different languages and dialects, of spending about £240,000 a year on its distribution, of having spent over £13,000,000 on the same work during the century, of having issued or caused to be issued in all about 254,000,000 copies of the Word of God to make God known to the speakers of 350 different tongues; yet an Anglican bishop admits, and his estimate is a very modest one, as I could easily show, that there are to-day multitudes in England who know nothing about God, and just enough of His Name to swear by It. And so, the "Simpler Christianity," the religion of "civic virtue and efficiency," the open Bible, and the Protestant apostolate of light abroad to those "who sit in darkness," have left God and Jupiter on the same level as objects of belief and worship at home; for they swear "by Jove," as freely as they use the other expletive—they swear by both and worship neither. The American Tract Society boasts that within the past two years it has published 750,000,000 tracts, in every known language and dialect; and the American Bible Society boasts that on the lists of its publications are 370 different languages, and 60 different kinds of alphabets; yet, what is true of those of the the "simpler Christianity" in England is at least as true of their brethren in America. It is a pitiful, although in a sense an amusing, commentary on the Pharisaical conceit of spreading the light of the Word amongst the Irish, the Spanish, the Italians, the Hindoos, the Kamptschatkadales, and amongst every people and tribe under heaven except themselves.

Lester again writes in 1876*:—

"My statements have stood the test of twenty-four years, and all my pictures of the vice, the degradation, the sufferings, the sottishness, the heathenism of the masses of the English people have been outdone since, by Reports made to the British Parliament on the horrors of the collieries, the barbarities practised in the workhouses, the worse than slave toil of the factories, the plethora of the Prelacy, the spiritual as well as the physical poverty of their flocks, the ignorance of the great herd of England's own subjects."

If any persons should suspect that I have selected the most horrifying accounts I would recall the revelations made by the Commission on the Housing of the Poor some years ago. I would also refer them to Mayhew's *London Labour and London Poor* for a picture of London fifty years ago; to Lester's book for a picture of England of thirty years ago; to *How the Poor Live*, by G. R. Sims, for a picture of London twenty years ago; to *Toilers in London*, by the British Weekly Commissioners, for a picture of London fifteen years ago; to the works of Clarke and Rowntree already quoted for a picture of actual factory life; to a series of discourses by the Hon. and Rev. Mr. Tyrhwitt, called "The Devil in the Potteries," which created a sensation some months ago, as they appeared in *The Staffordshire Sentinel*—and they will find that I have respected the modesty of my readers by sparing them the sickening sight of pictures of human misery, depravity and ignorance, which should make rational nature ashamed of itself. I could produce pictures of American life quite of a piece with those I have shown regarding England; but I have taken England as a type of that civilisation which material progress and Protestantism have produced, and I must not go beyond it. However, as I have quoted Lester, an

*Vol. I., page 26.

American, against England, I give the following extract which the Howard Association, in their Report for 1903, quote from what Dr. Shirley Bragg, Inspector of Prisons, wrote in the *Montgomery Advertiser* for December 19th, 1902, of the condition of some prisons in the home of material progress:—"The condition of many of the jails in Alabama beggars description. Prisoners are herded together in them like sheep, with no ventilation, no sanitation. . . . . reeking with filth and covered with vermin. . . . . This is a mild picture of existing conditions." Let us take another point of view. Inspector M. Lechstrecher, of New York, in his Report just made to the State Board of Charities, says he found that out of 10,707 children in the East Side districts of that city, only 1,855 began the day with a sufficient meal; 439 frequently came to school without any breakfast; nearly 1,000 children never had for their breakfast more than bread only or coffee only. That is the case, let it be observed, in one section only of the American capital. And New York is nevertheless a city of millionaires. Does that state of things tell us of human progress No; not even of material progress, which means much less. It reveals the extreme wealth of a few and the extreme want of many. A similar condition amongst the school children of English cities was the subject of a recent debate in the House of Commons; and some proposed as a remedy that the State should provide these children with breakfasts as well as with schools.

Charles Booth, President of the Royal Statistical Society, in his book, *Pauperism and the Endowment of Old Age*, says that of the people of England 2.8 per cent. of those under 16 years old; 3.8 per cent. of those between 16 and 60 years; 8.1 per cent. of those between 60 and 65; 25.9 per cent. of those over 65 years old, are paupers, depending on the State for their support.

According to the *Statesman's Year Book*, there is

In Holland 1 pauper to every 20 inhabitants.	Protestant Countries.
,, Germany 1 pauper to every 31 inhabitants.	
,, Norway 1 pauper to every 25 inhabitants.	
,, Great Britain and Ireland 1 pauper to every 39 inhabitants.	
,, Belgium 1 pauper to every 1,321 inhabitants.	Catholic Countries.
,, Austria 1 pauper to every 145 inhabitants.	

We are not to understand that there are no more poor in Austria and Belgium than appears from those statistics. "The poor we have always with us." But they are supported by the Christian delicacy of private charity; they are not thrown upon the State, and made to bear the ignominy of being labelled and branded as paupers. Christian charity provides for those who cannot provide for themselves in Catholic countries. The workhouse, with all the vice and indolence begotten of the system, is the offspring of the same spirit which also begat the Reformation. In England, when the patrimonies of the poor which were held in trust for them by the Church had been confiscated, and the poor, left to starve, were roaming over the country and were becoming dangerous to those who now possessed what should be theirs, the selfishness which robbed their patrimony instituted the workhouse system to save its plunder from their vengeance.

Thus, the "simpler Christianity," the "civic virtues and efficiencies," "the initiative and self-reliance," which it creates, and the material progress which it promotes, have left England with much more than an average share of want and wretchedness. Then economic selfishness comes to cure the evil by hiding the unfortunate ones in a workhouse away from its sight, and, forgetting that it has any such at home, goes abroad to be scandalized like a Pharisee at the *mendigos* of Madrid, or the *lazzaroni* of Naples. On the same principle Dives repelled Lazarus from his door; his "economic sense" was shocked by the sight of the poor man's misery. In an article in the

Contemporary Review,* Rev. W. W. Edwards contrasts the manner in which the poor are treated in English towns and the manner in which they are treated in Elberfield, a town of over 80,000 inhabitants in the Catholic province of Westphalia. He tells us that there is neither a pauper prison nor a public beggar there. The poor are helped in their homes. He says: "The Elberfield system is founded on the idea of respect for the destitute. . . . . It is deemed unworthy, to use the expression of Herr Prell, Chief of the Department of Poor Relief, to try a person's need by any such expedient as that which we English possess in the workhouse test." There are no workhouses to break up families and degrade the poor; such as the self-respect of our people turn away from in horror here in Ireland, and which the Catholic instinct of O'Connell rightly predicted would become hotbeds of vice; but there are, the Rev. Mr. Edwards tells us, "several alms-houses or asylums, into which admission is eagerly sought for by the aged and destitute poor . . . these are mostly connected with various religious denominations, and are free from State control."

Let mere economists try as they will, they will fail to properly provide for poverty; for the spirit of industrialism makes wealth the measure of worth, and therefore it really looks on poverty as a kind of crime. Tennyson's "Northern Farmer" was a true philosopher when he argued thus from his own principles, such as they were:—

> Proputty, proputty's ivrything 'ere, an', Sammy, I'm blest,
> If it isn't the saäme oop yonder, fur them as 'as 'it's the best.
> 'Tis'n them as 'as munny as breäks into 'ouses an' steals,
> Them as 'as coäts to their backs an' taäks their regular meäls.
> Noä, but it's them as niver knaws wheer a meäl's to be 'ad.
> Taäke my word for it, Sammy, the poor in a loomp is bad.

* For July, 1878.

That same spirit of industrialism which takes mothers from their homes, which leaves children without the refining influence of a mother's love, which indiscriminately mixes the sexes in factories and mines, drags human life at the wheels of the machinery which makes for material progress, ignores any higher mutual relation between employer and employed than that of so much wages for so much work, has naturally ceased to look upon the family as a sacred thing, and the essential unit of society. Hence economists, such as Bebel and Schäffle, say that "the family constitutes a function of society which we use provisionally, in want of others." Let that theory not be thought a dream of German metaphysicians. Only a few weeks ago one of the leading London newspapers opened its columns to a discussion on the subject. One of the correspondents, George Meredith, the novelist, suggested, as an improvement on the marriage contract for life, that the contracting parties would take a lease of each other for a term of ten years, after which they might renew the lease, or separate; and that the State should look after the rearing and training of the indefinite offspring which would be the natural result. It looks more disgusting than divorce, but it is only the logical outcome of the divorce system. Either system must ultimately turn human society into a menagerie of animals. But why a lease of ten years? Why not tenants-at-will The facility for divorce really leaves the actual non-Catholic system not a whit better than marriage at pleasure. And this brings me to consider briefly another element of national destruction or stability; namely, family life, and divorce. According to *The Guardian*,* 700,000 divorces have been granted in the United States within the past thirty years, whilst in Canada, except two provinces, the number is exceedingly low. In the

* cf. *The Tablet*, May 7th, 1904.

United States, 30,000 divorces on an average are granted every year. In England the average is about 700 a year; and petitions are becoming so numerous that the Divorce Court cannot cope with them. Let us reflect on the social consequence of so many houses and families broken up, of so many children left without a home, of so many characters of questionable reputation let loose upon society, and quite free under the sanction of the law, to found another home, to deceive another fellow-being, and again to be set at large by "the simpler Christianity" to corrupt society. South Dakota derives a considerable revenue from the facility with which divorces are granted there; for numbers flock there from all parts to share in those privileges which "the simpler Christianity" sanctions. According to the statistics made out by the National Family League—

In the State of Maine there is 1 divorce to every 6 marriages.
" " New Hampshire there is 1 divorce to every 8.3 marriages.
" " Vermont there is 1 divorce to every 10 marriages.
" " Massachussetts there is 1 divorce to every 16 marriages.
" " Rhode Island there is 1 divorce to every 8.4 marriages.
" " Ohio there is 1 divorce to every 8.8 marriages.
" " Indiana there is 1 divorce to every 7.6 marriages.
" " Michigan there is 1 divorce to every 11.0 marriages.

Mr. Burke Cockran, the well-known American Catholic orator, in a speech which he made on this subject last June at the Carnegie Hall in New York, very aptly said "Polygamy comprehends a group of wives at one time, while divorce simply means driving them tandem."

Those who call that a sign of civilisation would do well to reflect on those words of Jules Simon:—"It is not the loss of a battle and the annihilation of an army, or a province torn away, that brings the fall of a people. A people dies only by the relaxation of its morals, by

abandoning its manly habits, by the effacement of its character through the invasion of egoism and scepticism. It dies of its corruption; it does not die of its wounds."

Relentless fact has been recently forcing on statesmen, economists and publicists the truth of the economic and social philosophy contained in the doctrine and discipline of the Catholic Church which has always taught that the marriage contract cannot be untied, and has always kept that element in family life sacred from the interference of the civil power. It is instructive to reflect that the religious revolt in Germany began in lust, and that the sacrifice of marriage to the same passion was the occasion of the religious revolt in England. The Pope was unbending—he could not choose but be so; he sacrificed England to the sacredness of the marriage bond. Every form of Protestantism which has arisen since then, from orthodox Anglicanism on to Agnosticism, has attached the mark of obscurantism to the Catholic name, in Great Britain, the United States, Australasia, and throughout the British Empire, for guarding as a thing sacred from human touch the sacramental character of the marriage contract. The Church did not perceive the inter-action of economic forces; did not appreciate or mark the trend of social evolution, did not in fact know its Bible or grasp the true meaning of Christ's teaching on the nature of marriage.

But the Nemesis has come at last. The desecration of a Sacrament has slowly but surely brought its consequences out from the home, into economic, political, and civil life at large. Legislators laughed at Catholic teaching, politicians ignored the Sacramental groundwork of family life, and the nations are paying for their profanity. According to *The Guardian*, 700,000 divorces have been granted in the United States from 1869 to 1901. Taking account of the men and women

thus made homeless, and of the children left as if parentless, the Divorce Courts of the United States have left no less than 4,000,000 individuals without the blessing of family life within the past thirty years. Accordingly, what will be the condition of family life another generation hence? With that fact and that prospect before him, President Roosevelt spoke these words to a deputation of Episcopalians who recently appealed to him to help in healing the evil:—Questions like the tariff and the currency are literally of no consequence whatever compared with the vital question of having the unit of our social life, the home, preserved. It is impossible to over-estimate the cause you represent. If we have solved every other question in the wisest possible way, it shall profit us nothing if we have lost our own national soul; and we will have lost it if we do not have the question of the relations of the family put upon the proper basis." A few days afterwards he sent a message to Congress in which he ordered statistics to be collected on the subject, and declared that "the divorce laws are dangerously lax and indifferently administered." The conviction as to more or less laxity will not settle the question; as long as divorce is allowed at all reform laws will be only patchwork. The germ of the evil is secreted in the very principle of Protestantism. Once the doctrine of indissolubility is let go, the tide of human passion will flow in, breaking down all barriers and sweeping away all laws.

Material progress is only part of human progress, and that the least important part. When it is allowed to swallow up and assimilate the other elements by which it should be checked and controlled it brings its votaries back to barbarism again.

CHAPTER V.

SOCIAL ECONOMICS IN BELGIUM.

I HAVE taken England as a type of country in which Protestantism, the religion of "self-reliance and of civic virtue," has had full play, in which the "spiritual and economic ideals have been co-ordinated" according to the mind of Sir Horace Plunkett. I have traced, so far as the scope of my work requires, the trend of the industrial spirit there, and I have set forth the result in the words of non-Catholic writers exclusively. I wish that to be borne in mind. And this is the substance of what they have told us.

As happens in the case of an avaricious man who, in his eagerness to rush into riches by the most expeditious way, forgets that permanency is an element of prosperity, England has neglected agriculture, which would, under any circumstances, be a permanent source of national subsistence, and has striven for and achieved industrial and commercial greatness, which circumstances have mostly helped to make and which they can as easily unmake. The industrial prosperity of England has been the result of transient causes, such as the application of machinery and steam to industry, and those wars which, whilst they distracted the Continent, left England in peace at home and gave her a start of all other nations. Thus she took away the silk industry from France, the steel industry from Spain, the cloth industry from Germany, the glass industry from Bohemia, and she made all Europe a market for her manufactures. All that is now changed, and, what is more, the tide is turning fast.

On the other hand, agriculture has been neglected, the relations of social life founded on land are gone, and the people are crowding one another out of the centres of industry. It is, I think, clear that England has passed the highest point of her prosperity, and is already on an inclined plane. And from the point of view of material progress, what does that prosperity mean, taken at its best? Industrialism has brought enormous wealth to the few, and has left the multitude in a condition of want and misery which external glamour has till lately concealed, and which the stress of social necessity is now exposing in all their unspeakable nakedness to the public gaze. But that is not national wealth, not material progress from a national point of view. And in the specifically human element of progress what has this "simpler Christianity," with its co-ordinated ideals and the consequent "broader philosophy" brought to England? It has engendered vulgarity and vice in the individual, and is fast dissolving family life through the positive sanction of the divorce court. Again, I repeat, material progress is not human progress, material wealth is not the symbol of civilisation; it is not all, nor the most important part of what a nation should legislate or work for. Is man anything more than an animal? Answer yes, or no; philosophers of Naturalism! Economists of mere material progress!! If not, then why at all obtrude even the name of religion or morals in the affairs of human life? Why trouble our thoughts with even the name of God? Why trammel our animal license with the fetters which religion and morals impose? If man is something more, then that *something* is the noblest element in his nature; then that *something* must be considered first in the purpose and in the activities of his personal and social life, and the animal element must follow after; then religion and morals must be the first and unquestionable con-

dition of human progress and civilisation. It would be the plainest self-deception to label ourselves *men*, and then frame laws of economics for ourselves as if we were dogs or donkeys. And it does not improve matters to cultivate intellect; a sharpened intellect, without a will and heart rightly trained and disciplined, only makes one the better able to make mischief. The three elements in human nature must be combined and harmonised in order to secure a true and permanent human or social progress. One can respect, however one may grieve for the position of the late Professor Huxley. He found no place for God as a hypothesis for his science, and he said so. He held that his ideas budded from his brain by the same law under which flowers blossom on the rose-bush, or heads of cabbage grow in a garden; hence every idea of his was to him a dogma about which no man should dare to ask him doubt, whilst he rejected with scorn the dogmas of the Catholic Church; hence he equally scorned the religion of Humanity as a god presiding over the material progress of mankind, protesting that he would as soon "bow down and worship a wilderness of apes;" hence he held fast to the law of the "survival of the fittest" in human as well as in animal life; hence his method of managing the poor as manifested in letters which he wrote towards the end of 1890 whilst the unemployed of London were clamouring for bread or work. Let us only get ourselves to imagine that the first principle on which he stood is not a philosophical quagmire, and his position is sound and consistent throughout. But the philosophy of those, under whatever form of thought they enrol themselves, from Anglicanism to Positivism, who, whilst avowing that man is born for better things than this world can give, would have the economics which govern his present life to disregard the concerns of the next, is only solemn trifling with the sacred name of religion and with the eternal destiny of man.

On page 101 of his book Sir Horace Plunkett said that "Roman Catholicism strikes an outsider as being in some of its tendencies non-economic, if not actually anti-economic." On page 102 he says that "Roman Catholicism has, at different periods of her history, advantageously affected economic conditions," and that "during the Middle Ages, when its supremacy was practically unchallenged, and it was freer than now to manifest its influence in many directions, it favoured when it did not originate many forms of sound economic activity, and was, to say the least, abreast of the time in its conception of the working of economic causes." Having quoted these statements made on two consecutive pages, I let Sir Horace reconcile them for the public: I cannot do it. On page 103 he says that "We do not find Roman Catholic countries in the van of economic progress, or even the Roman Catholic element in Protestant countries, as a rule, abreast of their fellow-countrymen." "It would, however," he continues, "be an error to ignore some notable exceptions to this generalisation." And then he passes on to contradict himself in the next sentence, for he gives the reader some cause to smile at the number of exceptions to his generalisation. "In Belgium, in France, in parts of Germany and Austria, and in the North of Italy, economic thought is making headway amongst Roman Catholics, and the solution of social problems is being advanced by Roman Catholic laymen and clergymen." He might have included other exceptions, and he pulls the bridle on those he mentions by adding:—"Even in these countries, however, much remains to be done." I should like to know in what country *much* does not remain to be done.

Now, let us first consider what he means by that last sentence. Does he mean that these countries have not realised all their social and economic possibilities? If he means that, I simply reply that the sentence is not

worth wasting time on it. But I suppose he does not mean that, moreover, as he seems to be of those economists who believe in what is called the law of indefinite progress. Does he mean that, having no definite criticism to make on the economics of those countries, he writes the sentence for a make-believe that he has some fault to find? If that be his meaning, I classify it with the preceding. What, then, does he mean? Does he mean that much remains to be done by those countries before they have reached the economic water-level of those nations in which the "simpler Christianity" has left the people full economic elbow-room? That is what I now proceed to examine. I have taken England as a type of "economic" Protestantism; I now take Belgium as a type of "un-economic" or "anti-economic" Catholicism.

Belgium having passed under the dominion of the Spaniards, Austrians, French, and lastly under the dominion of the Dutch, it finally freed itself and became an independent country in 1830. The Belgians are preparing to celebrate the 75th anniversary of their independence next year. It is little more than one-third the size of Ireland; in fact, not much more than the size of Munster. Its area is 11,373 square miles.

In 1884 its population was 5,784,958.

In 1897 its population was 6,586,593.

In 1899 its population was 6,744,532.

In 1900 its population was 6,815,054.

In 1902 its population was 6,896,079.

In 1904 it must be about 7,000,000; that is, more than 600 persons to a square mile. It has proportionately a greater population than any other country in the world. How do they make it support them? Let me say first of all that there is no Congested Districts Board in Belgium. According to the *New Popular Encyclopedia*, edited by Dr. Annandale (1901), the total

value of its exports in 1900 was £131,900,000; the total value of imports for home consumption was £88,632,000. Its transit trade during the same year was £110,000,000. Its Railway System makes it the seat of so great a transit trade. There is not a town of any importance in Belgium which, owing to its complete railway ramifications, cannot, without difficulty and with little expense, convey the products of its manufactures to any market in the world. It has 3,000 miles of railway, that is, nearly as much as we have in all Ireland. Three-fourths is the property of the State, which keeps the rates of transit very low, in contrast to what happens here where trade is hindered by the cost of transit. In 1875 the amount of coal raised was 14,669,029 tons; in 1896 it was 21,252,000 tons; of which 5,000,000 tons were exported. The other principal mining industries are iron, lead, and zinc; and its chief manufacturing industries are linen, lace, carpets, cloth, cotton, porcelain, besides those of steel and iron.

According to a very exhaustive work by Father Vermeersch,* private industries in Belgium give employment to 1,130,000 persons. Taking the value of its commerce relatively to its population, Belgium holds the first place in the world. In 1902 the total value of exports and imports of the United Kingdom was £20 18s. 5d. a head of the population; in Belgium, for the same year, it was £25 a head. Since 1884 its "special" commerce trade has nearly doubled, and its transit trade has increased by more than one-half. During the same period the net receipts from the Post Office have nearly

* *Manuel Social:—La Législation et les Œuvres en Belgique.* It is a very exhaustive work on the social economy of Belgium. The latest edition, which appeared in 1904, published by A. Uystpruyst of Louvain, contains 1,009 octavo pages. cf. also—*Les Associations Agricoles en Belgique*, by Max Turmann; published by Lecoffre of Paris, in 1903. Also, *Au sortir de l'école; Les Patronages*, by the same author. The former explains and traces the development of the co-operative movement in Belgium; the latter shows what is done there for youth after leaving school.

doubled—*i.e.*, have gone up from 14,000,000 to 27,000,000 francs. During the same period the telegraph and telephone receipts have nearly quadrupled—*i.e.*, have gone up from 2,718,000 to 9,927,355 francs. The Savings Bank Account, which tells us of thrift and comfort, is as follows:—The deposits during 1884 were 86,368,705 francs; the deposits during 1902 were 340,490,263 francs; in other words, the deposits have nearly quadrupled. In 1884, the total balance to creditors was 141,942,464 francs; in 1902, the balance to creditors arose to 720,563,054 francs; in other words, had increased more than five-fold. At the end of 1884 the number of separate accounts in the Savings Bank was 406,656; at the end of 1902 the number was 1,973,480.

If one passes through the districts around Liege, Charleroi, Mons, and a few other industrial centres, one is inclined to think that Belgium depends on its mineral resources and its manufactures. He is mistaken. More than two-thirds of Belgium is under cultivation; about one-seventh is meadow and pasture land; and about one-sixth is covered with forests. Besides the profit made on the timber cut down, by dressing the stumps copses grow up from which they obtain tons of bark, which, after they have supplied their own tanneries, they export to England and other countries. The forests are also used to feed vast herds of swine. In 1880, out of 1,202,919 families, 910,396 were engaged in agriculture; but that includes those who hold only a small plot insufficient for their support, and who have to supplement it by some trade or other occupation. Of those, 472,471 hold about an acre each; 347,963 hold from one to twelve acres; 74,373 hold from twelve to fifty; 10,772 from fifty to a hundred; and 4,817 hold more than a hundred acres. Let us contrast England with that. According to Mulhall, the number of landholders of over ten

acres in England is 141,000; those owning 500 and upwards are 10,070. There is hardly a patch of available land in Belgium that is not either cultivated or turned to some profitable purpose. The Campine, a waste on which heaths and lichens hardly grow, lies partly in the provinces of Antwerp and Limburg. It is mostly moorland and barren sand; but wherever a patch is available the hand of industry has shown its work; cornfields, pastures, and meadows, are to be seen there on every side; some of the finest cattle in the country are raised there, and some of the best dairy and farm produce of the country is made there. It has been reclaimed by agricultural colonies; some of them poor families who voluntarily sought a living there rather than bear the brand of paupers; others are convicts who are made to give their labour for the nation in penalty for offences committed against it. Seeing what their industry has made of the worst, we can understand what they make of the best. In Flanders alone about £1,500,000 is annually raised on flax.

Some years ago the Belgians began to suffer from those economic conditions which have lessened the value of farming. In 1886, the Abbé Mellaerts, the parish priest of a district in the Campine, called his people together, explained to them the power of organization and its necessity under actual circumstances. The people were convinced and had the courage to try; and thus began the Boerenbond or Peasants' League which has since spread over all Belgium. Its objects are: the defence of the religious, moral, and material interests of the peasantry; the improvement of land legislation; and the organization of agriculture. It is placed under the patronage of St. Isidore, the patron of agriculturists; and although the League is not a religious association, the members of the different guilds which are affiliated to it must go regularly to their religious

duties; and each year the Feast of St. Isidore is specially celebrated by the members and their families. There is also the Agricultural Federation of Hainault founded by Canon Douterlungue and Father Lechien; the Luxemburg League, the chief promoter of which is the Abbé Couturiaux; but the strongest association is the Boerenbond of Louvain, founded by the Abbé Mellaerts, with the help of M. Helleputte and M. Schollaert. It has 400 local guilds and 25,000 members. In 1901, it had business transactions to the amount of 13,906,986 francs.

In 1897 there were in Belgium 572 Agricultural Leagues
In 1898 ,, ,, 607 ,, ,,
In 1899 ,, ,, 638 ,, ,,
In 1901 ,, ,, 776 ,, ,,

As to Agricultural credit there were in 1894 only 4.

In 1895 there were 33 with 1,160 members.
In 1897 ,, 158 ,, 5,689 ,,
In 1900 ,, 264 ,, 11,669 ,,
In 1901 ,, 286 ,, 13,308 ,,

For improving the breed of cattle—

In 1896 there were 71 Societies of 4,000 members
In 1901 ,, 312 ,, 12,000 ,,

In 1884 there were 36 technical schools for boys.
In 1896 ,, 70 ,, ,, ,,
In 1884 ,, 4 ,, ,, girls.
In 1896 ,, 26 ,, ,, ,,

It will be observed that all this progress has been made since 1884, whilst the Catholic Government has been in power. On ten different occasions since then the country has been appealed to, and the country, with its universal suffrage has each time returned the Catholics to power. From 1870 to 1878 the Malou ministry was in power; that ministry was also Catholic.

When it went out there was a Budget surplus of 33,000,000 francs. From 1878 to 1884 the Liberals were in power, and they went out with a deficit of 59,000,000 francs. In 1884 the Catholic Ministry came into power again, and in 1886 they began to show a credit balance, which has now reached 166,000,000 francs. Yet, no new tax has been imposed, and some have been either abolished or reduced. About 100,000,000 francs are spent each year on works which are directly reproductive; about 26,000,000 francs on works that are indirectly reproductive; about 5,000,000 francs on works of general utility; about 3,000,000 in the interests of agriculture, etc., etc.,

If I am asked now to show the shade of the picture as well as the light, I reply that it is not my business to do so. My purpose has been to show, from the instance of Belgium, that Catholicism is not a hindrance to national progress. Yet I think I am correct in saying that there is more misery in one of England's great cities than there is in all Belgium with its 600 persons to the square mile. I think I can also safely say that one never hears of a death from starvation there. Moreover, since the Catholics came into power in 1884, they have almost put an end to the work of women and children in mines, which is the source of so much depravity and vice in England. Catholics have been the first to raise their voices generally against the employment of women and children in factories and mines. In Germany, the Centre Party fought the question on the lines marked out by Von Ketteler, the Bishop of Mayence. In Belgium, the question was raised by M. Bernaert, the leader of the Catholic Party. It was raised in France by Count de Mun; in Switzerland by M. Decurtins; in Austria by Dr. Ebenhoch and by Mgr. Scheicher; in Holland by Father Schaepman, the

leader of the Christian democrats in Parliament; in Spain by Rodriguez de Cepeda.*

I now conclude with the following extract from the *Statesman's Year Book* for 1901. At page 438, it tells us:—"The Roman Catholic Religion is professed by nearly the entire population of Belgium. The Protestants number only 10,000, while the Jews number about 4,000. The State does not interfere in any way with the internal affairs of either Catholic or Protestant Churches. Full religious liberty is granted by the Constitution, and part of the income of the ministers of all denominations is paid from the National Treasury. The sums granted in the Budget for 1898 are 5,234,000 francs to Roman Catholics, 93,200 francs to Protestants, and 19,000, francs to Jews, besides 56,000 francs for various Ecclesiastical expenses. There are few endowments, and the clergy derive their maintenance chiefly from fees and voluntary gifts."

I have made this extract as a lesson in toleration to some of my readers, if they will only learn it.

From an interesting book published in 1896 by E. E. Williams,† I take the following proofs of industry and progress in Belgium:—

In 1893, her output of foundry-pig, forge, and Bessemer-pig was 745,264 metric tons.

In 1894, her output of the same articles was 810,940 metric tons.

In 1893, her output of finished iron, rails and plates was 113,602 metric tons.

In 1894, her output of the same articles was 122,474 metric tons.

In 1893, her output of steel ingots, etc., was 273,113 metric tons.

* cf. *La Revista Internazionale*, Aprile, 1902. Pages 555 and *seq.*
† *Made in Germany.*

In 1894, her output of the same was 396,914 metric tons.

In 1893, her output of steel rails and plates was 224,922 metric tons.

In 1894 her output of the same was 314,776 metric tons.

Belgium began the steel industry with any kind of activity about 1868 or 1870, and the production of it increased 50 per cent. in ten years. According to a letter of Mr. Simon, of Manchester, quoted in the *Iron and Coal Trades Review*, January 31st, 1896:—"Every pound of the iron roof of the large railway station in Middlesborough is made of Belgian iron;" and Middlesborough is one of the chief centres of the English iron trade.

According to H. de B. Gibbons,* the produce of Belgian smelting works increased in value from £2,000,000 stg. in 1838 to £5,000,000 stg. in 1860. In 1845 there were 14,000 operatives engaged in iron-works, and the output was 62,000 tons for that year; in 1860, more than 26,000 were employed; in 1870, more than 40,000 were employed, and the output for that year was 500,000 tons. The iron and steel manufactures are worth £10,000,000 stg. In textile fabrics Belgium has shown a similar record of success and progress. As early as 1830, about 12,000 steam engines were in use, employing 20,000 horse power. But the steam power employed soon increased enormously. In 1860, it was 162,000; in 1880, it was 200,000. The flax and linen trade has not increased so fast as others. But in 1890 there were 100,000 acres under flax; and for ten years ending 1887, the export of linens averaged about £800,000 annually. In the 40 years from 1840 to 1880, her textile manufactures increased in value from £6,000,000 stg. to £17,000,000 stg., that is nearly

* *Economic and Industrial Progress of the Century*, 1903.

threefold; and although their value is at present about the same, it represents an increased volume of trade. The value of hardware goods made now is more than that of the textiles. It is estimated at £19,000,000 stg., which is an increase of £3,000,000 stg. on the value for 1888. Mining also has increased 50 per cent. since 1870.

England rests her hope for the future in her trade with her colonies. But in this also, we can learn a lesson from the following table, which shows the exports of iron and steel from the United Kingdom and Belgium to India:—

	From the United Kingdom.		From Belgium.	
YEAR.	IRON.	STEEL.	IRON.	STEEL.
	tons.	tons.	tons.	tons.
1883-84	3,473,619	240,149	86,657	10,981
1894-95	1,956,721	369,753	1,176,179	448,091

Thus England, from supplying India with 98 per cent. of her iron, and 95 per cent. of her steel as in 1883-1884, shows a decline to 61 per cent. of iron, and 41 per cent. of steel in 1894-95. England's actual decline has been nearly 50 per cent. in iron against Belgium's increase of 1,257 per cent., and Germany's increase of 700 per cent. Of steel, England supplies 1½ as much in 1894-95 as in 1883-84; but then Belgium supplies 40 times as much, and Germany 50 times as much in 1894-95 as they supplied in 1883-84.

Of linen yarn the exports from England are steadily decreasing, whilst the imports are steadily increasing.

In 1870, she exported 37,239,314 lbs., and imported 3,081,597 lbs.

In 1880, she exported 16,437,200 lbs., and imported 5,958,731 lbs.

In an article in the *Nineteenth Century*,* Archibald

* June, 1883.

W. Finlayson says that a Manchester Merchant showed him an invoice for £500 worth of goods for shipment to the East, and said—"Formerly, I gave all such orders to English manufacturers, now I order all in Belgium on account of price. These goods are shipped direct from Belgium, and of course are not heard of in this country."

I think I have now given evidence quite and more than enough to establish these two things: first, that their Catholicism has neither extinguished nor weakened the industrial spirit of the Belgians; and second, that even in the sphere of mere material progress, Belgium is more progressive than England. I have not yet exhausted my evidence, and if anyone be not convinced by what I have given, I shall be glad to give more. Meanwhile I think what I have already given confirms these words which Mr. Rae wrote in the *Contemporary Review*, in 1880:—"Belgium is not only a Catholic country, but the most Catholic of countries. . . . No other Catholic nation contains so small a proportion of dissidents from the faith, nor is there any other Catholic nation where the dogmas of the Church are so sincerely accepted. . . . Yet it has adopted from the first the most modern of modern constitutions, embodying every popular liberty in its complete length and breadth. Freedom of conscience, religious equality, freedom of the press, of meeting, of association, of education, Parliamentary Government, ministerial responsibility, universal suffrage, inviolability of person and house, equality before the law, permanence of judicial appointments, publicity of legal courts, trial by jury, have all been not only legalised but protected in Belgium, without any of the evasions which make similar legislation in some countries virtually a dead letter."

I will supplement those words of Mr. Rae by the

following which appeared in the *Daily Telegraph** :—"Civil liberty in Belgium exists in almost republican profusion. Even the fact that the ultramontane (Catholic) priesthood garrison the land, does not prevent the Belgians from enjoying the utmost freedom in respect of religion. Commerce flourishes, and manufacturing industry advances at a pace so rapid that even we in Britain are every now and then pressed by the shadow of Belgian rivalry. Time would fail us, too, were we to speak at adequate length of the agricultural prosperity of the country. It is not an exaggeration to say that it is simply a huge garden, that every available spot of earth is under tillage of the finest sort; that every economist, from McCulloch down to Mill, has lavished the highest praises on the Belgian farmer, and on the condition to which he has brought high husbandry in his happy country." These words, which I have transcribed from Young's *Catholic and Protestant Countries Compared*, are confirmed by the following which appeared in the *Mark Lane Express*, in January, 1903 :—"The Belgians can say to us with truth—We support $\frac{9}{10}$ of our population with the produce of our own land, besides exporting each year £20,000,000 of agricultural produce, whilst your agriculture supports only half of your population. Where you feed one cow, we feed two, and in every square mile of arable land we support 360 persons more than you."

I have not undertaken to show that there are millionaires in Belgium. Millionaires are not a sign of national progress or prosperity; the presence of many of them is rather a sign of the contrary. But on the other hand I am certain that nobody can write of the Belgians what Mr. Sherrard has written of the English in the *White Slaves of England*, in *The Cry of the Poor*,

* August 2nd, 1878.

and in the series of articles on the *Child Slaves of Britain* which he has been contributing to the *London* magazine since last January. Let anyone read those writings and say whether England is in a state of progression or of retrogression, whether it is marching onward in civilisation or receding backwards. We see the natural outcome of mere industrialism in the misery, ignorance, and vice of the English millions who have nothing, and in the more malignant viciousness of the few who have everything; in the license to break up family life which is implied in the decisions of the divorce court; in that which President Roosevelt has fittingly called the race suicide, which is threatening the populations of America and England. Who will say that Australia has not made material progress? Yet I have just read an article* on the Report of a Birth Rate Commission which has been held there recently, and it makes the awful revelation that Australia has forfeited a third of the people it should have, through the "civilisation" which a Godless industrialism and a Godless education have brought them. I make this long extract from it, because of its importance, and because it is based on an official document:—

"The Report of the Birth-Rate Commission throws a red light on the frightful state of morality in Australia. As the result of immoral practices the population of this young country, it is now officially stated, is one-third less than it ought to be—that is to say, a million of people have practically been murdered by Australian parents. The Austalian nation is in the dock to answer the most gigantic charge of homicide ever drawn up, and one which is supported by unanswerable evidence. There is no reply. The truth is admitted by all. To out-Herod Herod was long thought to be a crime too great to compass, but Australians have

* *The Catholic Press* of Sydney, March 17th, 1904.

achieved that notoriety. Our land is dyed with the blood of infants; and yet as so many are guilty there is no popular outcry for punishment. The attitude seems to be that of moral irresponsibility. The daily papers have dealt with the situation in a lackadaisical manner. It may be that the revelations are so great and shocking that to suggest a remedy is beyond their power. The crime goes on cheerfully, and it is probable that the Report of the Commissioners will soon be forgotten, and that child-murder and race-suicide will proceed in triumph.

"What is the cause? Is it that our civilisation is effete, and that out of it has come the most vicious form of paganism? When you take religion from civilisation you have left only a cold materialism or utilitarianism which puts personal convenience and comfort above everything else in life. In other words the Commissioners give the same reasons for the prevalence of child-murder:—'An unwillingness to submit to the strain and worry of children, a dislike to the interference with pleasure and comfort involved in child-bearing and child-rearing, a love of luxury and of social pleasure which is increasing.' Here is civilisation without God with a vengeance.

"It is only within the past 20 years that race-suicide, as President Roosevelt calls it, has been prevalent in this country. One of the reasons given by the Commissioners is that the religious feeling which was a restraining force in the past, has lately been weakened or removed. They do not dwell on the fact that secularism has been the policy of the State during that period, and that children are being educated in the State schools without any religious influence whatever, just as if they lived in a pagan country. It is sad to think that this system of education, which is the fruit-

ful mother of infidelity, is supported by the Protestant churches because they believe that no change could be made without doing justice to Catholics, who alone are protecting the faith and imbuing education with the principles and the spirit of religion.

"The laws in regard to divorce must also be reckoned as a cause of the looseness of morals in the community. Hundreds of families are being broken up in the Sydney Divorce Court every year, and the guilty persons are being re-married by men who call themselves ministers of religion. What sanctity does that leave in the marriage bond, when outrages on it are so encouraged by the State and sanctioned by the Protestant churches?

"The Royal Commissioners have also to confess that race-suicide has had Judicial sanction given to it, and to quote the decision of the Full Court (per Windeyer and Stephen, JJ.; Darley, C.J., dissentiente) in the case *ex parte* Collins recorded in the Law Reports, New South Wales, vol. ix. 1888. The Commissioners say:—'Extracts from this decision have been scattered broadcast, not merely in Australia, but in Great Britain, by the advocates of limitation of families, and by a certain class of booksellers who cater for vicious tastes or engage in the traffic in preventatives. In a four-page leaflet published in England, a copy of which is before the Commission, Mr. Justice Windeyer's remarks are quoted at some length. The remarkable coincidence between the promulgation in 1888 of the views expressed in this judgment and the sudden fall in the birth-rate in 1889, cannot, we think, be considered fortuitous. Those views have, we consider, been a powerful factor in reconciling the consciences of many people to the degrading practices of prevention, and have thus materially helped to cause the acceleration of the decline of the birth-rate which so soon followed upon their enunciation.'

"That surely is a shocking scandal, a New South Wales supreme Court Judge encouraging from the Bench practices which can only be described as murderous. Is it any wonder, when all these causes are considered, that a low moral tone exists? And now, which are the safeguards? The legislation suggested may do something, but we fear it will not go far. Unquestionably, the only hope is religion. Instead of preaching sectarianism and hatred among people, Protestant ministers must turn their attention to the Sermon on the Mount. Some non-Catholic clergymen are known to sacrifice themselves for the good of the people. Is it too much to hope that their example will be followed? The Catholic Church is, of course, the only safeguard and the greatest moral force in the community. She protects her children from the cradle to the grave, and no such practices can take place within her household. She and she alone has authority over her people; she directs the individual conscience through the Confessional; she lays down what we must believe, what we must do, what we must reject, what we must avoid. The Church's creeds and pronouncements are loyally and frankly accepted for the guidance of mind and heart; for she is the perpetual voice of Christ. In Ireland, the most Catholic country in the world, the Commissioners show that the decrease is the smallest on record, and is scarcely perceptible, although the young people have been leaving the country for the United States at the rate of about 60,000 a year." At a conference organised by the Department of Education, on April 5th, 1904, to discuss the Commissioners' Report on which the article from which I have just quoted has been based, Cardinal Moran drew attention in the course of a searching and powerful speech to the grave perils which threaten the country through the materialistic spirit, and he showed on the testimony of non-Catholics,

especially in the United States, that what is called non-sectarian education has been in great part the cause, and that a definite religious education is the true remedy for the social disease that is destroying the nation's vigour.

The late Herbert Spencer truly said—"There is no mere political alchemy by which you can get golden conduct out of leaden instincts." And mere mental culture is as powerless as money to procure it. Education which is not founded on religion is but mere instruction which sharpens the intellect, and thus enables a person or a people to make vice more malignant by making it appear more refined. A man's or a people's intellect may be so trained as to become a mere instrument to minister to the passions of sense. Again, I repeat, mere material progress is not human progress, and mere wealth, or even mere mental culture is neither civilisation nor a sure sign of it. Unless the nobler element of a man's nature is properly provided for, his progress is impossible; that is, he may progress as a pig, but not as a man; and what is true of the individual is true of the nation.

Having set economic England and economic Belgium side by side, my task is so far finished; and the public, not Sir Horace Plunkett or myself, shall be the judge as to how far Catholic Belgium, a little country about twice the size of Yorkshire, shows signs of economic life in comparison with England. If I passed on to consider Germany, which has now become proverbial for its industry, I think I could show that its Catholic provinces show more economic activity than the other provinces. The heart of German technical education and industrial life is the Rhineland, which is as Catholic as Ireland. In the Düsseldorf exhibition of last year—only a local exhibition—the machinery section alone covered over five acres. Düsseldorf is as Catholic as Limerick. It

is often pointed out that the Catholic Cantons of Switzerland are poorer than those that are Protestant; and that even in the same Canton the Catholics are in misery and the Protestants are in comfort. Thus Mr. Hepworth Dixon says that in the Canton of Appenzel, the Protestants are industrious, sociable, and rich, whilst the Catholics are indolent, poor, and form a scattered population. It is partly true; but it reminds me of these words of Tennyson, which are equally applicable to many like allusions to the condition of Catholic countries: —

"And the parson made it his text last week and he said likewise—
That a lie that is half the truth is always the blackest of lies,
That a lie that is all a lie may be met and fought with outright.
But a lie that is part the truth is a harder matter to fight."

The whole truth is that the Canton of Appenzel is divided into two districts—Inner-Rhoden, a mountainous district, and Ausser-Rhoden in the valley. The former is inhabited by Catholics, and the latter by Protestants. The former has naturally a scattered population, mostly herdsmen, for the district can be but little cultivated; the latter can be easily cultivated, and naturally maintains a thicker population in greater comfort. Religion has had nothing to do with it, unless in so far as religious intolerance forced the Catholics to the mountains. But, on the other hand, statistics of illegitimacy show that the morals of the inhabitants of Inner-Rhoden is as superior to that of the inhabitants of Ausser-Rhoden, as the morality of the people of Mayo is superior to that of the people of Antrim and Down.

*The Times** informs us, on the authority of an analysis of marriages, births, and divorces, published by the Bureau of Statistics, at Berne, that in 1881 there were 19,425 marriages in Switzerland, which is a low proportion compared with other countries in Europe. And it proceeds:—"The number of divorces in 1881 was greater than that of any previous year on record—1,171 suits were granted and 946 decrees for dissolution of matrimony granted. In 1880 the figures were 1,069 and 856 respectively. In some of the older cantons—Uri, Obwalden, Nidwalden, and Appenzell-inner-Rhoden—no divorces were either asked for or pronounced. In Appenzell-ausser-Rhoden, the Protestant half of the canton, the proportion of divorces to marriages in 1881 was 13.18 per 100, the highest in the Confederation. In Thurgau the proportion was 9.22; in Geneva 8.79; Zurich 8.68; Lucerne 1.48; the Valais 0.18 per cent.; the purely Catholic cantons being always much less given to divorce than the Protestant and mixed cantons."

It is to be observed that divorce, which means a dissolution of marriage leaving either party free to marry anyone else, cannot exist amongst Catholics. The indissolubility of marriage is a dogma of the Catholic Church. Anyone who disbelieves or doubts that doctrine ceases *ipso facto* to be a Catholic. If any persons whilst believing it, act against it by accepting a decree of divorce from a civil tribunal, they may call themselves "Catholics," but till they retrace their steps they cannot receive the Sacraments of the Church or participate in any of its spiritual gifts. For valid reasons, husband and wife may lawfully live apart; but that is quite a different thing from divorce which leaves either of them free to marry somebody else. Such a thing as divorce, that is the dissolution of a ratified

* September 15th, 1883.

and consummated marriage has never been, is not, and cannot be recognised in the Catholic Church.

It is also to be observed that, according to anti-Catholic writers, the Catholics are, as a body, the poorest of the Swiss population. I have already explained the cause; but I wish to add the following which I take from *The Times'* article which I have just quoted:—"Divorces in Switzerland, it may be well to mention, are much less frequent among the easy classes than among small traders and working folk. In good society, divorces, as giving rise to scandal, are not regarded favourably; and people who apply to the tribunals for release from their matrimonial bonds run the risk of being cut by their acquaintances. But among the masses these scruples are unknown." Now let us draw our inference from these three facts.—The Catholics are the poorest of the population; divorce is most frequent amongst the poorest of the population; and yet it is least frequent amongst the Catholic portion of the population. In the course of the article it is also stated that "difference of religion (*i.e.* mixed marriages) is one of the most frequent causes of divorce."

If I am reminded of the fallen condition of Spain, I remind my reminders of her once prosperous condition. Moreover, Spain was most prosperous when she was most Catholic. It would be outside the scope of my work to trace the causes of her decline, but whoever consults Balmes* will learn that her fidelity to Catholic faith need not be numbered amongst the causes of it. Tyre and Babylon were once wealthy; so was Rome; and the Spanish conquerors of Mexico found there an accumulated wealth which they had not dreamed of. Nations, like families, whatever be their religion, have

* *Catholicism and Protestantism compared in their effects on European Civilization.*

their infancy, their maturity, and their decline. But, unlike old Rome, Spain has not become effete; she has not lost the power of rejuvenescence. On the contrary, she shows unquestionable signs of revival. Mr. J. S. Mann writes*:—"M. Victor Bèrard has shown us a new Spain—vigorous, practical, adaptable; and the latest reports of our consuls confirm his conclusions, as has been shown above. Spanish industry and commerce, misjudged or ignored by tourists who visit Madrid, and the memorials of the mediæval glories of the peninsula, is reviving and multiplying. . . . . Barcelona, formerly the great colonial port, is now making extraordinary strides. . . . . But the conspicuous instance of economic progress is in mining, which ought to be the primary industry of Spain. Bilbao in 1901 exported upwards of 4,000,000 tons of iron ore. . . . . and the success of Bilbao, which has been progressing for forty years, is stimulating mining industries in other parts of Spain. Corunna and Santander were centres of trade with the colonies; they are becoming ports for mining regions. Similar progress is noted at Huelva, and in the numerous mining regions of Southern Spain; and the Altos Hornos works make bars, girders, plates, and frames of every description, employ 5,000 men in all, and are quite able to bear comparison with first-class works in the United Kingdom."

M. Berge, in a very interesting article in the *Correspondant*† shown that the loss of Cuba and the Philippines has awakened the national conscience, and has marked the beginning of a new departure and of a new life in Spain. Government provision and private industry have already so increased and improved agriculture that the Spaniards are no longer so dependent on

* The *Fortnightly Review*, February, 1903.
† *Le relèvement économique de l'Espagne*, September 10th, 1904.

foreign produce as they used to be. He also shows that commerce and industry, especially mining industry, have progressed beyond all expectation. The Government has been encouraging and helping private enterprise by the creation of technical schools, by industrial commissions, by the reduction of tariffs and taxes, and by patronising the formation of new companies. A nation in which society has not become intrinsically corrupt may have its day of decline, but it never loses the power to revive, however historic or economic causes may have paralysed her for a time. It is one thing to catch a cold and to lie prostrate with a fever; it is another thing to lie prostrate with one's energies wasted from an evil life. One feels the fever more whilst the illness lasts, but it soon passes; one never recovers from the decrepitude begotten of vice. Old Rome was rotten, and it could never rise again. When the day of England's or America's decline will have come, will they show the same power of recuperation which Spain is showing now? The question closely concerns the subject I am discussing.

Now, I suppose that some, who have been reading what I have written on the prosperity of Belgium, have been saying—"Ah; but what about Ireland?" They will know presently more about Ireland than perhaps will be welcome news to them.

CHAPTER VI.

CHARACTER IN IRISH CATHOLICS.

Having fairly traced to their historic causes the present shortcomings of Irish Catholics in relation to their civic and industrial functions, Sir Horace Plunkett writes*:—"But, after all, these criticisms are, for the purpose of my argument, of minor relevance and importance. The real matter in which the direct and personal responsibility of the Roman Catholic clergy seems to me to be involved, is the character and *morale* of the people of this country. No reader of this book will accuse me of attaching too little weight to the influence of historical causes on the present state, social, economical, and political, of Ireland, but even when I have given full consideration to all such influences I still think that, with their unquestioned authority in religion, and their almost equally undisputed influence in education, the Roman Catholic clergy cannot be exonerated from some responsibility in regard to Irish character as we find it to-day. Are they, I would ask, satisfied with that character? I cannot think so. The impartial observer will, I fear, find amongst a majority of our people a striking absence of self-reliance and moral courage; an entire lack of serious thought on public questions; a listlessness and apathy in regard to economic improvement which amount to a form of fatalism; and, in backward districts, a survival of superstition, which saps all strength of will and purpose—and all this,

*Page 110.

too, amongst a people singularly gifted by nature with good qualities of mind and heart."

I have already dealt with the influence of Catholicism on human progress and civilisation. I have shown that even in the sphere of mere material progress, towards which the Catholic Church disavows any direct duty, Catholic countries have led the way where countries which have adopted "the simpler Christianity," or naturalism, have not followed. But, Sir Horace will say, why have not the Catholics of Ireland done so? I do not fix the blame on the Catholic Church, but on the persons who represent it, or belong to it; and I appeal to the condition of Catholic Ireland in proof of my case.

That wise old pagan philosopher, Epictetus, used to say—"*Initium doctrinæ est definitio nominis.*" I followed his wise counsel when I was discussing the question of progress. I considered what the idea of progress as applied to man should be, and I hope I have left my readers convinced that the view of progress which is set forth in Sir Horace Plunkett's book is a low and a narrow one. What I said did not imply that he admits no wider or higher view. I prescinded from what his personal notion of it may comprehend, and dealt with what was set forth in his book; which I have taken to be that of mere naturalism. I showed that if we boldly follow out that notion to its consequences we must in consistency place men and kangaroos on the same specific level. Naturalistic economists do not like to be reminded of that; they are frightened by the ghost which their own philosophy raises; they try to put it away and hide it from their sight, but logic will not let them. They like the reality, but they dislike the name; just as certain persons *will* be "fast" men and women, but they affect offence and show resentment if they are taken for such. The philosophy of naturalism is perfected before the looking-glass; it penetrates one's personality no

deeper than one's achievements in the dining-room.

I proceed now to analyse the idea of character after the same manner. I will rather trace a description than give a definition of it. Character is the moral texture or disposition which is formed in a person as the result of repeated action and of habitual thought. We say that one is a man of character if we find him showing persistent activity in striving after some purpose which he has set before himself, or in suffering trial and loss for a principle. For character is proved in passivity as well as and even more than in activity. The early Christian martyrs proved themselves men and women of character by sacrificing their lives for their principles. I do not now consider whether those principles were true or false. Our fathers who gave up their lives as well as their lands in Ireland for their principles proved themselves thereby to be men of character; otherwise they would have kept their lands and saved their lives, as they might easily have done by turning their backs on their principles and by lying to themselves. Our national poet thus set forth the inspiration of their lives:—

> "There is a world, where souls are free,
> Where tyrants taint not nature's bliss;
> If death that world's bright opening be,
> Oh! who would live a slave in this?"

It is by suffering and loss rather than by activity and gain that character is chiefly tested. Again, the Jews have proved themselves to be a people of character in that they have preserved their racial identity through the vicissitudes of two thousand years. The Boers have shown themselves men of character in their struggle for their homes and their independence. The miser is a man of character; even the *roué* shows his character in the plans he lays and persists in carrying out in spite of

danger and difficulty for the gratification of his desires. Dr. Smiles gives a bookful of examples of persons who proved their character in the persistency with which they surmounted difficulties in the pursuit of success in life. Nano Nagle and Catherine Macauley showed themselves women of character in establishing and spreading the communities they founded, in spite of the opposition of persons and other difficulties of the times. Sister Bernard has proved herself to be a woman of character in thinking out and executing her plans for the great industrial work she has done at Foxford.

The purpose towards which one directs his activity, or the principle for the sake of which one suffers, colours the nature of the character that is formed or revealed, although the character itself is proved by the persistency with which one pursues a purpose or suffers for a cause. Hence a man of character is one whose individuality comes out, shows, and asserts itself in doing difficult deeds or in bearing great trials.

And even when we say that a person is "a character" who has little will of his own and is easily moved by others, we place his individuality in relief inasmuch as we suggest that he is a person of peculiarities. There is, therefore, a good and a bad character, just as there is a merit for good and a merit for evil. The martyrs showed their character in seeking heaven, the miser shows his character in keeping money, the man of industry shows his character in making it. Again, of those who show character in pursuing purposes which are good in themselves and in their sphere, the Saints and Martyrs showed character in striving through difficulties and in facing death for a reward in the life to come. The immediate object of the industrial spirit is a reward in this life. It is the distinction which St. Paul drew between the corruptible and the incorruptible crown. Amongst the strongest characters of any age have been

those whom the Catholic Church calls Saints; such as St. Paul, St. Agnes, St. Gregory VII., St. Catherine of Siena, St. Teresa. St. Francis de Sales was a man of uncompromising character in spite of his singular meekness, or rather because of it. In other walks of life, Columbus, Fernando Cortez, Napoleon, Clive, were variously men of character; and so on to Barney Barnato or Whitaker Wright.

Sir Horace Plunkett links character with the industrial spirit, but in that he is plainly wrong. To identify with one thing a quality which many things have in common is a pitfall into which hobby-jockies invariably and unthinkingly tumble. Sir Horace is possessed of the industrial spirit, and he easily takes for granted that there is no such thing as character unless that which spends itself in industry. On the other hand, a Quietist who seeks rest for his soul, a Mahatma awaiting the Nirvana, the modern Christian scientist, or others cast in a like mould would call themselves men of character. But a philosopher would open his eyes and look without prejudice before and around him over the whole field of human activity where every human energy is exercised and every human activity is pursued. As a Catholic I must look at life in that way, and if I narrow my reason exclusively within a spiritual sphere, in so far do I turn off at a tangent from the Catholic ideal. The spirit of Catholicism is opposed both to the spirit of industrialism and to the spirit of esoteric Buddhism. Industrialism and experimentalism are like a magpie's nest; everything on which their votaries can lay their minds or hands goes into it. Those who are led on by that spirit want to gather into their own narrow corner of interest every human activity, as if men were made to live either in a laboratory or in a factory, or at least should have their highest interest there. Those who are possessed by the industrial spirit, and those who call themselves "men

of science" are ever boasting of their breadth of view, whilst they are amongst the most narrow-minded of mankind. The consumptive talks of health, because he has it not, and the men of fallen fortune talk of wealth, for they feel the need of make-believe. So with many who affect enlightenment beyond their kind. They are the magpies and the bullies of the day; but a bully is soon beaten, and his rule is never long; and once he is beaten he soon shows himself for what he is. The naturalistic economist or the "man of science" is satisfied to think of men as only evolved animals—will quickly concede everyone to be an ass except himself—provided he reigns as silver-king, or as philosopher among the apes.

Character shows itself in every phase of human activity, exerting its divergent energies in every direction, heavenly or earthly, good or evil. According to Catholic philosophy man has his supernatural and his natural purpose in life; each must be kept in view; and every human activity, spiritual, moral, and material, must have its proper place, working into one another in the machinery of human life.

But, let us examine the relation of Irish Catholics to character in the sense in which Sir Horace uses it.

The first condition that is necessary for the exertion of human activity is liberty. I refer to character as it manifests itself in activity, and which is impossible without liberty; but I do not forget that the strongest character might be proved in the sacrifice of liberty for principle, and in such case slavery would be the result and the proof of character. I have already recalled the sacrifices made by our forefathers under the Penal Laws in proof of their character; because only a strong character could suffer so much for a principle. Many of the Young Irelanders and Fenians were men of strong character. Had they turned the ability and constancy which they showed in furthering those move-

ments towards making their way in the world some of them would unquestionably have achieved remarkable success; and they proved themselves men of strong character as much, and even more, in prison than when they were free and were forming plans for the realization of their hopes. Many of them, after they were set at liberty, became men of distinction in civil and commercial life. It will be said that it is a pity they had not always used their ability and constancy for some more useful purpose. That is not the question. I prescind altogether from the merits of their cause or the wisdom of their conduct. I want to show that they were men of character. If anyone should think that their objects were evil, or uselss, or foolish, let him not conclude that therefore they were not men of character, but that their character exerted itself in evil, useless, or foolish ways. That would be the only consequence; for character is specified by the purpose which it pursues or by the principle which it tries to maintain. Hence a character might be good or bad, profitable or useless; but it is character all the same. I have insisted on this so much, because economists seem to think that character should necessarily turn to industrial pursuits, that it exclusively or chiefly belongs to economic life, that it is essentially meant to act rather than to suffer.

I find another instance of the strength of character of Irish Catholics in the action of the 40s. freeholders who voted against the Beresfords in Waterford in 1825, and against the dominant class in Clare in 1828. It was a great sacrifice made for a great principle at a great crisis. It meant eviction and loss of suffrage for them, but they had counted the cost. It will be said that they were not free to vote otherwise than they did at those elections. But, I ask, how so? Because, it will be said, they were forced by O'Connell and by the priests to do as they did. Very well,

then. It used not to be so. Their votes used to be determined by those who had got the franchise for them, not to make them freemen, but to make them more useful slaves. The franchise was extended to the 40s. freeholders with the Relief Bill of 1793, not for the sake of those freeholders themselves or the Catholics in general, but in order to strengthen the voting power of the other side, since it was taken as a matter of course that their votes as well as their lands were the property of the landlords. They used to be driven to the polling places at election times, and kept together, as cattle are kept in pins beside a goods-train at the railway station of a market town. They used to be driven by the landlords. When they voted on the popular side it was said by those whom they had dared to defy that they were driven by O'Connell and the priests. Now, supposing this to be true, the question remains, what is that determining power which made them change their driver? Plainly it was principle, the instinct of civil right, which had been dragged along by the despotism of those who had it in chains, but which at a crisis rose up in the might of desperation, and, casting away its shackles, beat the Beresfords in Waterford and irreparably smashed the power of oppression in Clare. They suffered sorely for their courage; but they have the honour of having been the first to lay the axe to the root of the upas-tree, and of giving the Catholics of Ireland a foretaste of the potential energy that lay reserved in the will of a people. The lesson was not lost on them. And, if the 40s. freeholders were deprived of their right of suffrage when Catholic Emancipation came, the sacrifice added as much honour to them as it brought dishonour to those who had them disfranchised. But was it not unwise for those Catholics to forfeit their franchise, and to suffer eviction, or to bear increased and impossible

rents? It certainly was an act of unwisdom which "shocks the economic sense"; it would not come within the sphere of the "civic virtues" of those practical people whose "strenuous qualities" threaten to line the ditches about the Boyne when there is no danger of having their chivalry tested by even the report of a pop-gun.

The Irish Catholics who did those deeds and bore those consequences in their struggle for their civil and religious rights unquestionably proved themselves to be men of strong character. Or, what better evidence of their strength of character should anyone want? Should we expect them to inaugurate industrial movements or form co-operative societies? Such things were not thought of, or if thought of, only thought of as Utopian in those days. The Catholics of Ireland were then struggling to secure such a condition of affairs as would make industry possible or profitable. "Self-reliance and moral courage" were necessary for such a purpose, and the Catholics of Ireland proved their character in striving for and achieving it. It was the only kind of opportunity they then had of proving that they were men of character, and they proved it.

The history of Irish Catholics for the last hundred years has this thread running through it—a denial of existing grievances; a partial redress of those same grievances; that partial redress made with a bad grace and unwillingly; when made, a boasting of the fairmindedness of those who yielded up those rights; the admission that such grievances had existed, together with expressions of regret that they should ever have been, and a demand on the gratitude of the people for the pretended liberality that lessened those wrongs, and an acknowledgment of the magnanimity which now acknowledged and regretted them; a denial that any more grievances remained to be re-

dressed—reprobation and imprisonment to any who pointed out to the people that more remained, or who dared to urge the people to another struggle to take those also away; again, an unwilling and partial redress of those—then the same staging of magnanimity, justice, contrition, and tears—then the further demand for the removal of remaining wrongs—the denial of any more—then another struggle—more turmoil and trial—then unwilling and partial redress—and so, denial, assertion, demand, struggle, and success, have followed one another by rotation in the political life of Ireland during the past century. That has been the web of our history in every department of Irish Catholic life. And if those long withheld rights have been yielded to the people only after struggle, strife, and suffering in every case, how have those measures of justice been effected? Only by the persistent fight for principle on the part of the people, in spite of misrepresentation, obloquy, imprisonment, exile and death. And they have never considered the creed or even the country of those who championed their cause. They followed Butt and Parnell as they had followed O'Connell, Gavan Duffy and Frederick Lucas. Sir Horace Plunkett acknowledges that he himself has secured a following beyond all his expectation, and notwithstanding personal disadvantages of more than one kind. In fact he says that the priests "have put no obstacle in the way of the Roman Catholic majority choosing Protestants for political leaders"; that "it is no disadvantage to a man to be a Protestant in Irish political life, and that where opposition is shown to him by Roman Catholics it is almost invariably on political, social, or agrarian, but not on religious grounds."

The history of Irish Catholics for the past century, then, shows not only character, but character of a very

enlightened kind.* That century has been spent in political strife, because it was the only path, although a thorny one, open to them for the enjoyment of those civil rights which are a necessary basis of any industrial life or success.

* For evidences of "character and morale" shown by Irish emigrants abroad, see Froude's *English in Ireland*, Vol. I.—570, 571, 572. Lecky's *Hist. of Ireland in the 18th century*, Vol. I.—153, 169, 228, 232, 233, 234, 247, and *seq.* 570, 571.

It is important also to note that most of the Protestant colonies brought over and planted in Ireland have died out. A number of Scotch farmers who came over about two generations ago, and took land to farm by improved methods, have long since disappeared.

The following is taken from the *New York Evening Post*, of Nov. 10th, 1903:—

A novel analysis of the last census returns has been made by the Massachusetts' Bureau of Statistics of Labour to show the proportion of the different nationalities in the various industries. The result shows such a predominance of the Irish race that Massachusetts may almost be said to be a New Ireland. Just where the old native stock of Massachusetts is left seems problematical, for the foreigners have an overwhelming majority in the industries—and the Irish are a large majority of them—while in the Government service the Irish are more than double all others of foreign birth, and they are about a third more than those of Massachusetts birth or descent, or of other native birth or descent. It is true that if all of native stock or descent in the State, or born out of it, are counted, they have a bare majority in the Government service, or 50.98 per cent. But in the classification, all those whose parents were born in this country are counted as natives, and thus the foreign stocks do not get the credit of their true total; for the second generation acts with the first generation as a whole, in religious, social, and political affairs.

Nine classifications are made under the head of professional occupations—religion, law, medicine, literature, art, music, amusements, education, and science. In everyone except art the Irish are the most numerous among the foreign born, and the distribution among the different professions in this State doubtless indicates what is probably true of the race in all other States. In science, next to art, the race shows the least relative lead; but under the head of Education, which includes thousands of schoolteachers, they have 2,506 out 4,700 of foreign descent, while the English stand a remote second with only 527. In Science, the Irish have 326 to 248 English; in Literature, they have 252 to 129 English; in Medicine, they have 489 to 215 English; and in Music, they have 458 to 361 Germans, 306 English, 152 Italians, 120 French-Canadians, and so on. The record under Art is, 86 Irish to 132 English, 85 Germans, 30 Scotch, and down-

ward. But in Religion, where the priests count, the Irish have 1,134 to 331 English, who are second. In Law, they number 333 to 64 English, who come second. In Medicine, they have 489 to 215 English, and 206 French-Canadians. In each of the nine professions classified the native element is in a majority, except in religion, where the proportion stands 49.40 per cent. native to 50.60 foreign, and in most instances the excess of natives is very large, rising to 80.69 in Law, and being nearly as high in literature, medicine, education, and science.

In Domestic Service the Irish have predominated. Out of 56,500 foreigners in all in this field they have 33,079, the Nova Scotians coming second with a small total of 4,096, the Swedes being almost abreast with 4,088, and the English being fourth with 3,045. Out of the total in Domestic Service the foreigners have 79.57 per cent. to 20.43 natives. The extent to which the Irish are pushing forward in trade is seen in the fact that of the 20,630 Merchants and Dealers, 7,865 are of this stock, while Russians number 2,294, and English 2,200. Foreign and native are divided about evenly under this occupation, for the latter have only 23,414, or 53.15 per cent of the whole. The total percentage of foreigners under the head of Salesmen and Saleswomen is 45.87, and there are 5,866 Irish to 1,629 English, who stand next in number, with English-Canadians third at 992, and Germans fourth at 956. Under the classification of Accountants, Bookkeepers, and Clerks, there is a total foreign percentage of 43.44, but of the foreign, Ireland has 10,963 representatives to 3,331 for England, and 1,935 for the French-Canadians, who stand third.

In Manufactures, the work has passed largely away from Americans, and has gone into foreign hands. Boots and shoes show best for the natives, for they have 46.23 per cent. of the total employees. The Irish come first of the foreigners with 20,665 to 6,552 for the French Canadians, who are second. In building trades, the foreigners have 61.87 per cent of all workers, and the Irish have 15,690 to 6,359 for the French-Canadians, who are second. In Carpet-making the foreigners have 89.54 per cent of all, and the Irish are 1,796 to 630 English, who are second. In Clothing Manufactures the foreigners have 66.72 per cent., and the Irish count 12,626 against 2,754 French-Canadians, who are second. In making cotton goods there is the only instance in which the Irish are outnumbered or anywhere near it. The proportion of foreign workers is 91.58 per cent. The Irish are 23,298 strong to 23,829 French-Canadians, 12,686 English, and 2,204 Germans. So one turns to occupation after occupation and finds similar predominance of the Irish over all other foreign-born. The second place is at a long distance below the first, and this fact seems to have its bearing upon the recent adoption by the Boston Aldermen, in concurrence, of the order that the educational authorities be requested to have the Irish language taught in the public schools."

CHAPTER VII.

IRISH CATHOLIC INDUSTRY.

I HAVE taken the trouble to show that a person or a people may in other ways, both passively and actively, than in industry or commerce, give evidence of "character and *morale*." I have done so because it is not only false in itself, but it is unfair to the public to discuss questions which affect the social well-being of a nation, on the assumption that the only test of character in a person, or in a people, is their activity and success in industrial or commercial life. It is unfair because it is a dangerous and a degrading ideal to set before a people. In spite of reason and conviction, it is sure to influence them; because it is a plain appeal to the stomach, and to the passions of sense in general. From what I have already written, and more than once insisted on, no person can suspect me of ignoring civic duties, the natural virtues, or the claims of industry. Moreover, let enthusiasts have their way; they have a right to it; no great movement has ever been begun or carried through without enthusiasm. Let men also have their hobbies, but unless they ride with circumspection they are sure to come to grief; at any rate, they have no right to ride rough-shod over everyone and over everything that comes in their way. We must, before all things, search for truth in its fulness, and grasp it if we can, and as far as we can; it is unworthy of us whom God has gifted with reason, not with sense merely, to be satisfied with truth watered down by fancy or by conventional assumptions.

Having lifted the notion of "character" from the low level on which Sir Horace Plunkett places it, to a higher plane and in a broader view, I proceed to examine whether he is correct in saying that the Catholics of Ireland are wanting in that "character and morale" which industrial life demands. It is due to him to recall that he has taken account of the historic causes of their industrial shortcomings. But he holds those causes to be only partial; and to account for all our drawbacks he supplements them with the un-economic spirit of our Catholicism and the neglect of the industrial concerns of the people on the part of those who represent Catholic authority in Ireland.

Now, his general reference to those historic causes and his particular reference to Catholicism as a supplementary cause of the industrial apathy of Irish Catholics, makes it necessary for me to look back and see if those historic causes may not be plenary and not only partial causes of our industrial drawbacks. He admits the historical factors of our economic shortcomings, it is true. But since he also brings in Catholicism as a supplementary factor, he forces me to go over the ground.

The Navigation Act of 1660, let Irish ships enjoy the same privileges as English ones. The importance of that privilege will appear at once from the fact that European commodities or manufactures could not be imported into the English colonies except from England and in English ships, manned by English sailors; nor could any be brought from those colonies into Europe except through England and by English ships. There were a few exceptions not worth considering. Irish ships manned by Irish sailors, then, were, according to Navigation Act of 1660, to be taken for trading purposes as English ships manned by English sailors. But that community of privilege seems to have been

given for a purpose. "For," says Froude, "the equality of privilege lasted only till the conclusion of the settlement, and till the revenue had been assigned to the crown."* That Navigation Act was amended in 1663, and in the amended form Ireland was left out. All exports from Ireland to the English colonies were prohibited. Moreover, the main source of Irish wealth at this time was the fattening of cattle, and the cattle trade with England. That also was prohibited; and the reason was bluntly given, namely, that "the richest and best land of this kingdom (*i.e.*, of England) is employed in the feeding and fattening of cattle, and that by the coming in of late of vast numbers of cattle already fatted, such lands are in many places much fallen, and like daily to fall more and more in their rents and values." In 1665 an Act was passed which declared the importation of Irish cattle, live or dead, into England to be "a publick and common nuisance." For, when the cattle trade was prohibited the Irish killed the animals and sent large quantities of salted meat across to England; and the prohibition was then extended to beef, bacon, pork, mutton, butter, and cheese. Soon afterwards, according to Lecky,† "it was provided that no goods of any kind could be imported directly from the colonies into Ireland." At this time began the Irish trade with France, Spain, Portugal, and Italy; but it was very limited. The cattle trade was killed as we have seen, and it was the chief trade of Ireland, since, owing to the Cromwellian war and its consequences, the country had been mainly turned to pasture.

"Being forbidden," says Lecky,‡ "to export their cattle

* *English in Ireland*, vol. I., page 179. Cf. also Lecky—*History of Ireland in the 18th Century*, vol. I., pages 173, 175, 176.

† *Ireland in 18th Century*, Vol. I., p. 174.

‡ Loc. cit. p. 175.

to England, the Irish landowners turned their land into sheep walks, and began on a large scale to manufacture wool." But the following will best show how fared this next resource of Irish industry.

How the Irish woollen trade was destroyed is thus described by a Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1825:—

Both Houses of Parliament addressed King William on June 9th, 1698. The Lords stated in their Address that "the growing manufacture of cloth in Ireland, both by the cheapness of all sorts of necessaries of life, and the goodness of materials for making all manner of cloth, doth invite your subjects of England, with their families and servants, to leave their habitations and settle there, to the increase of the woollen manufacture in Ireland, which makes your loyal subjects in this kingdom very apprehensive that the further growth of it may greatly prejudice the said manufactures here, by which the trade of this nation and the value of the lands will greatly decrease, and the number of your people be much lessened here; wherefore, we humbly beseech your Most Sacred Majesty that your Majesty would be pleased, in the most public and effectual way that may be, to declare to all your subjects of Ireland that the growth and increase of the woollen manufacture there hath long and will be ever looked upon with great jealousy by all your subjects of this kingdom, and if not timely remedied, may occasion very strict laws to prohibit and suppress the same; and, on the other hand, if they turn their industry to the settling and improving the linen manufacture, for which generally the lands are very proper, they shall receive all the countenance, favour, and protection from your royal influence for the encouragement and promotion of the linen manufacture to all the advantage and profit they can be capable of."

The Commons stated their sentiments at the same time in the following terms:—"We, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons in Parliament assembled, being very sensible that the wealth and power of this kingdom do in a great measure depend on the preservation of the woollen manufacture as much as possible entire to this realm, think

it becomes us, like our ancestors, to be jealous of the increase and establishment of it elsewhere, and to use our utmost endeavours to prevent it. And, therefore, we cannot without trouble observe that Ireland, which is dependent on and protected by England in the enjoyment of all that they have, and which is so proper for the linen manufacture, the establishment and growth of which there would be so enriching to themselves, and so profitable to England, should of late apply itself to the woollen manufacture, to the great prejudice of the trade of this kingdom, and so unwillingly promote the linen trade, which would benefit both themselves and us; the consequence whereof will necessitate your Parliament of England to interpose to prevent the mischief that threatens us, unless your Majesty, by your authority and great wisdom shall find means to secure the trade of England, by making your subjects of Ireland to pursue the joint interests of both kingdoms. And we do most humbly implore your Majesty's protection and favour in this matter, that you will make it your royal care, and enjoin all those you employ in Ireland to make it their care, and use their utmost diligence to hinder the exportation of wool from Ireland, except to be imported hither, and for discouraging the woollen manufacture, and encouraging the linen manufacture of Ireland, to which we shall always be ready to give our utmost assistance."

His Majesty thus replied to the Commons :—"I shall do all that in me lies to discourage the woollen manufacture in Ireland, and encourage the linen manufacture there, and to promote the trade of England."

Stronger declarations could not well be made than these Addresses and answers, that if the Irish would come into the compact of giving up their great staple of woollens to England, and cultivating the linens in lieu thereof, they should receive "*all the countenance, favour and protection for the encouragement and promotion of their linen manufacture to all the advantages their kingdom was capable of*"; that the Commons would always be ready to give their utmost assistance, and his Majesty would do all that in him lay to encourage *the linen manufacture there*; and they had the effect of inducing the Parliament of Ireland to accede, as will appear from what follows :—

The Lords Justices of Ireland say, in their speech to the Irish Parliament, September 27th, 1698 :—"Amongst those Bills there is one for the encouragement of the linen and hempen manufactures. . . . The settlement of this manufacture will contribute much to people the country, and will be found more advantageous to this kingdom than the woollen manufacture, which, being the settled staple trade of England, can never be encouraged here for that purpose; whereas the linen and hempen manufactures will not only be encouraged, as consistent with the trade of England, but will render the trade of this kingdom both useful and necessary to England."

The Commons replied :—"We pray leave to assure your Excellencies that we shall heartily endeavour to establish a linen and hempen manufacture here, and to render the same useful to England, as well as advantageous to this kingdom; and we hope to find such a temperament in respect to the woollen trade here that the same may not be injurious to England." In pursuance of this answer they evinced that temperament most effectually by passing an Act for laying prohibitory duties on the export of their own woollen manufacture—thus accepting the national compact, and fully performing their part of the agreement, and by that performance giving an incontrovertible claim to Ireland upon England, and consequently upon Great Britain, for a perpetual encouragement of the linen manufacture "*to all the advantages and profit that Ireland should at any time be capable of.*"

It is to be observed that so anxious was England to confirm and enforce this ratification given by Ireland, that their Parliament soon after passed a law affecting to enact what subsequent times have shown it was incompetent to, and which we, therefore, here mention merely to point out the stress which England laid on the sacrifice made by Ireland of its great and natural staple trade, in exchange for a new staple resting on a material not the natural growth of the country, and the establishment of which was but in its infancy, though nurtured for over sixty years by the Government of the kingdom. The Act we refer to is the 10 and 11 Will. III., cap. 10, which recites "that wool and the woollen manufacture of

cloth, serge, bays, kerseys, and other stuffs made or mixed with wool, are the greatest and most profitable commodities of the kingdom, in which the value of lands and the trade of the nation do chiefly depend; that the great quantities of the like manufactures have of late been made, and are daily increasing in the kingdom of Ireland, and in the English Plantations in America, and are exported from thence to foreign markets heretofore supplied from England; all which inevitably tends to injure the value of lands, and to ruin the trade and the woollen manufactures of the realm; and that for the prevention thereof, the export of wool and of the woollen manufacture from Ireland be prohibited under the forfeiture of goods and ship, and a penalty of £500 for every such offence.

Now, what do we learn from those official documents? They testify:—(1st) "The goodness of materials for the manufacture of all manner of cloth" in Ireland. (2nd) "The growth and increase of the woollen manufacture in Ireland hath long been and will ever be looked upon with great jealousy by" the people of England. (3rd) That Ireland had of late applied itself "to the woollen manufacture to the great prejudice of the trade" of England. (4th) "That great quantities of woollen manufactures have of late been made and are daily increasing in the kingdom of Ireland."

Now, in face of this, how can we attribute industrial apathy to the Irish people whose "strenuous qualities" in the production of wool and in the manufacture of woollens so roused the alarm and jealousy of England? They had been engaged on the woollen manufacture for a long time, but they began to devote special attention to it when their shipping and cattle trade had been legislated unto death; and in a few years they so succeeded, both as to "the goodness of materials for making of all manner of cloth," and as to the "daily increase of the same," that their success threatened to attract his Majesty's "subjects of England, with their families and

servants to leave their habitations and settle in Ireland."

Were the Irish a Catholic people then? And did their 'uneconomic' or 'anti-economic' Catholicism relax their character, or unnerve those 'strenuous qualities' which make for commercial enterprise and industrial success? The chief centres of the woollen manufactures in Ireland were Clonmel, Kilkenny, and Carrick-on-Suir. I am not unaware that colonies of Walloons had been brought over; but the chief support of the trade came from the Irish themselves.

Let anyone honestly examine those words of the English and of the so-called Irish Parliament, and then let him try if he can find a parallel to the tergiversation, the treachery, avarice, meanness, and dishonesty, which they reveal. Ireland had perforce to accept the compact involving the destruction of the Irish woollen trade and the encouragement of the linen trade in Ireland. It was a compact of England's own making. We shall see how she kept it.

Those Parliamentary documents which I have already quoted at some length plainly imply, even avow, that the Irish traders in wool, and the manufacturers of woollens had in a short time made such progress in that industry as to threaten the destruction of English wool and woollens and the consequent decrease in the value of land in England. I have said that the same documents reveal tergiversation, treachery, avarice, meanness, and dishonesty. The petition of the Lords in the English Parliament humbly sheweth that the continuance of the woollen manufacture in Ireland would tend to depeople England. The Lords Justices of Ireland, in their speech to the Irish Parliament, say that its discontinuance would "contribute much to people" Ireland. Again, according to the Lords and according to the Commons of England, the land of Ireland "is so proper for the linen manufacture"; and they regret that

the Irish "so unwillingly promote it," which "would benefit both themselves and *us*." All that is set forth in the same context in which they declare that the trade of England is threatened by Ireland's progress in the production of wool and in the manufacture of woollens; and, in spite of that progress, the Lords Justices of Ireland assure the Irish Parliament that linen manufacture which Ireland had, till then, but little tried, "will be more advantageous to this kingdom" than the woollen manufacture, which Ireland had tried, and so successfully. The Irish Commons, in their reply, hoped "to find such a temperament in respect to the woollen trade here that the same may not be injurious to England"; and the Irish Parliament proved that "temperament" by imposing "an additional export duty of 20 per cent. *ad valorem* on Irish broadcloth, and of 10 per cent. on new drapery, except frieze."* Let us reflect on the fact that this Irish Parliament thus openly helped to fetter, manacle, and hang the woollen industry of the people whose wishes and interests they were supposed to represent. "To complete the work of destruction," says the writer just quoted, "the English Parliament passed a law on June 29th, 1699, interdicting the exportation of Irish woollens except to England and Wales; and import duties were previously laid on them so high as to be prohibitory."

"The English, however," says Lecky,† "were still unsatisfied. The Irish woollen manufactures had already been excluded by the Navigation Act from the whole Colonial market; they had been virtually excluded from England itself, by duties amounting to prohibition. A law of crushing severity, enacted by the English Parliament in 1699, completed the work

* *Commentaries on Ireland—The Cloncurry Prize Essays.* By Wm. Stanley, page 130.

† Loc. cit., page 177.

and prohibited the Irish from exporting their manufactured wool to any other country whatever. So ended the fairest promise Ireland had ever known of becoming a prosperous and happy country. The ruin was absolute and final."

This final prohibition is contained in the Parliamentary document which I have already quoted; namely, that "the export of wool and of the woollen manufacture from Ireland be prohibited under the forfeiture of goods and ship, and a penalty of £500 for every such offence." "Thus deprived of their export trade," says Stanley in the work already quoted, "and not having a home trade of sufficient extent to maintain their establishments, the Irish manufacturers emigrated, some to the Protestant States of Germany, where they founded manufactories for the celebrated Saxon cloths—some, who were Catholics, to the North of Spain—and many, both Protestants and Catholics, to France, where they founded establishments at Rouen, and other places, and were warmly received by Louis XIV., who guaranteed to the Protestants the free use of their religion, although he had previously revoked the Edict of Nantes." * The country was thus cleared both of the manufactures and of the manufacturers. Not of all the manufacturers, however. According to Hely Hutchinson, author of the *Commercial Restraints of Ireland*, within two years after the prohibition from 20,000 to 30,000 workers in wool had to be supported by charity in Ireland. We can understand what proportion of the people had thrived with the success of the woollen industry, and were ruined with its ruin, when we consider that the whole population of Ireland was at that time only 1,034,102† according to the Census of Captain South. That industry, the ac-

* Page 131, Cf. Dobbs, page 6, 7, and *seq.*

† According to others the population was 2,000,000.

knowledged success and the sudden progress of which unquestionably establish the industrial ability and "character" of the Irish Catholics of that time, was thus swept away, root and branch. I speak of the Irish Catholic manufacturers only, because only their character is in question. The Scotch and English who had been engaged in the woollen industry in Ireland were, as we are asked to believe, industrial by nature; their "simpler Christianity" did not allow a "complete shifting of the moral centre of gravity to a future existence"; they had learned from their economic Christianity to "develop the qualities which make for well-being in this life"—just as their representatives in Ireland to-day who "have developed the essentially strenuous qualities which, no doubt, they brought from England and Scotland." And was the industrial skill of those exiled manufacturers lost or lessened when they went abroad? The following, which I quote from Stanley,* will tell us. "Mr. Dobbs, whose work on Ireland, published in 1729, and who was an eye-witness of those commercial changes, observes:—'The Irish have so much improved the woollen manufactures of France, as not only to supply their own markets, but vie with the English in foreign markets; and by their correspondence have laid the foundation for the running of wool thither, both from England and Ireland, highly to the prejudice of Britain.'" The same has to be recorded of those who went to Spain.

So far, at any rate, it is not Irish Catholics who "shock the economic sense," but the economists who paralysed their industries unto death; and so far also it is not correct to say that "the Roman Catholic clergy cannot be exonerated from some responsibility in regard to Irish character," unless that, as I suppose, they preached a doctrine then as now which prevented the Catholics from

* Loc. cit.

confounding "character" with exclusively making wool or making money.

But, in destroying the Irish woollen manufacture, it was not intended at all to destroy every Irish industry. What then was the grievance? There was the linen industry, which was "so very proper to the land of Ireland," and which would "benefit both themselves and *us*." Parliament pledged itself to the Irish to give "all the countenance, favour, and protection, for the encouragement and promotion of their linen manufacture to all the advantages their kingdom was capable of"; and King William pledged himself to do all that in him lay "to encourage the linen manufacture there." It was a compact forced upon Ireland, I quite admit; but yet it was a compact of England's own making, and accepted in the name of Ireland by a so-called Irish Parliament which represented England and about one-seventh of the inhabitants of Ireland. It was a compact even less free than those "free contracts" which used to exist between landlord and tenant before the impress of Mr. Gladstone's work appeared in the Irish land laws.

Now, let us see how they kept their compact.

Flax had been cultivated and linen had been made in Ireland long before this time; but not much of it. Lecky says that "Strafford had done much to encourage it."

That is true; but it is not the whole truth. Strafford encouraged the linen manufacture instead of the woollen manufacture which he did his utmost to destroy in the interest of England, long before it was legislated out of existence. In helping the linen manufacture he was only proving himself a faithful prophet of the power he represented. The Duke of Ormond had also helped to advance it; but it had never become a staple industry in Ireland as the woollen industry was; and the war of the Revolution which had given a temporary check to the latter had almost de-

stroyed the former; so that it neither profited nor promised much for the country when those who legislated away the woollen trade pledged themselves to promote it.

As to the promised encouragement of the linen manufacture, Stanley says, in the work already mentioned:—"All that can be said for the monopolists is, that they tolerated the Irish linen trade for a time, as it did not clash with their interests; but as soon as they thought of manufacturing linen, the spirit of monopoly was evoked, and a law was passed prohibiting the importation of chequed, striped, printed, painted, stained, or dyed linens, of the manufacture of Ireland; and granting bounties on the exportation of such linens, of the manufacture of England. There was also a duty imposed on the importation of Irish sail cloth, and a great encouragement was given to establish the linen trade in Scotland, of which the Scotch made so good a use, that in 1783 no less than 17,000,000 yards of their linen were stamped for sale."

Nothing was done till 1705, when, the Irish Parliament having reminded them of their pledges and setting forth the poverty which the loss of the woollen manufacture had brought on the country, they allowed the Irish to export white and brown linens, and those only, to the British Colonies; but the Irish traders were not allowed to bring back any Colonial goods in return. If I am asked how that could be, I have only to recall the fact that ships should be laden in England. That prohibition to import Colonial goods in return for their own exports was in itself a damper on the limited Irish linen trade which was allowed. According to an address presented by the Irish House of Commons to the Viceroy in 1774—"The Irish had manufactured flax and hemp to such good purpose that at one time they had supplied sails for the whole British navy." Yes, "at one time," but not at the time of the address;

because, in 1750, heavy import duties were laid on Irish sail-cloth sent into England which seriously damaged the trade Again, Lecky says that "Irish checked, striped, and dyed linens were absolutely excluded from the Colonies. They were virtually excluded from England by the imposition of a duty of 30 per cent., and Ireland was not allowed to participate in the bounties granted for the exportation of these descriptions of linen from Great Britain to foreign countries." Lord North, when he was Prime Minister, in a speech in Parliament, said of this compact—"This compact was no sooner made than it was violated by England, for instead of foreign linens, duties were laid on and necessarily collected, which, so far from amounting to a prohibition on the import of the Dutch, German, and East country linen manufactures, that those manufacturers have been able, after having duties imposed on them by the British Parliament, to meet, and in some cases to undersell, Ireland, both in Great Britain and the West Indies, and several other parts of the British Empire." The pledges made were certainly kept, but within limits, and after a fashion. Bounties were given to encourage the manufacture of linen; but that was not till 1743 when, says Lecky, "the country had sunk into a condition of appalling wretchedness"; and even then, that encouragement was confined to the coarsest kinds of linen. It was, moreover, enacted in 1756 that "no Irish linen exported from England shall be entitled to a bounty, if it were the property of a resident in Ireland." The conditions of that bounty, make it not only not a bounty, but a plain bribe to Irish linen manufacturers to settle in England.

Whilst the solemn compact of 1698 was thus kept for Ireland, and its linen manufacture was fast facing the fate of the woollen, the linen manufacture of Scotland

was growing apace. How did that come about? By the "strenuous qualities" of the Scotchman, Sir Horace Plunkett would say. Perhaps, so; but this is what Buckle*:—"During the seventeenth century, the only Scotch manufacture of any importance was that of linen, which, however, like every other branch of industry, was very backward, and was exposed to all sorts of discouragement. But after the Union, it received a sudden impetus, from two causes. One of these causes was the demand from America, consequent on the trade of the Atlantic being thrown open. The other cause was, the removal of the duty which England had imposed upon the importation of Scotch linen." England thus not only broke her pledge of special protection and encouragement for the Irish linen industry, but even deprived Irish manufacturers of the distributive justice of fair competition by taking away duty from the Scotch and by imposing a heavy one on the Irish.

Moreover, let us read in the light of what I have just written the following which happened in Ireland. The linen manufacture had, as in Scotland, been also extending in the North of Ireland. Some French workers settled there in 1700, and one of them Crommelin, became a well-known manufacturer. He agreed to establish a centre in Kilkenny, if his patent were extended. It was well enough whilst Crommelin was extending the industry of the North; but it was another thing when there was danger of carrying his beneficence to the South. The English authorities set their face against the patent; which, however, through the influence of Ormond, was afterwards granted, provided that the southern manufacture would be limited to linen of the coarsest kind. We can understand how the "economic sense" of our non-Catholic masters was differently affected by the prospect of prosperity

* *Hist. of Civilisation in England*," Vol. III., 178-179.

in the North and in the South. But one of the reasons given involves another violation of the compact. It was, that if Irish linen displaced Dutch linen in the English market, the Dutch might boycott English woollens in Holland; and, in that way, the success of the linen manufacture in Ireland, especially in the South, might indirectly injure the woollen manufacture in England. Those economists cannot, at any rate, be accused of "shifting the moral centre of gravity to the other life." Lecky writes*:—"The linen manufacture also greatly increased, but especially in the North, where, the population being in a great degree Protestant, the paralysis of the Penal Laws was comparatively unfelt. The English Government gave it some real encouragement in the form of bounties, and Irish linen was admitted freely to England, while that of other countries was clogged by heavy duties. . . . Belfast, though still ranking very low in the list of Irish towns, was beginning to emerge into prominence." Lecky must have here forgotten what even he has written elsewhere—and indeed he is not always consistent—or he must have included the rest of Ireland outside the North, amongst those "other countries clogged with heavy duties." In spite of those disabilities, "the Irish linen manufacture, within the narrow limits that were assigned to it, had attained a considerable prosperity, and it continued to increase till 1771, when an alarming decadence began which continued with accelerated rapidity during the next two years. Many causes were assigned for it, the principal being the interruption of commerce due to the rising troubles in America."†

That is not bad testimony to Irish industrial activity, struggling against almost insurmountable diffi-

* Loc. cit., page 338.
† Lecky—loc. cit.

culties. And even in the woollen trade Ireland was not idle. Prevented by law from the manufacture of woollens, the Irish could not so easily be prevented from the rearing of sheep and the production of wool, and they continued to do a large wool trade with the Continent. Wool was secretly sent in smuggling ships to the Continent from every bay in the southern coast of Ireland; and other goods were smuggled back in return and sold in Irish towns. Gradually the smuggling became contagious, and was extended to other articles of commerce. Many Catholic families who, when the restraints of the Penal Laws had been taken away, became extensive land owners, had made the purchase money and more with their smuggling ships of the Penal Days. Even in that smuggling trade there is clear evidence of their industrial character. I will be reminded that such trading bears witness to their lawlessness. Be it so; but it also is evidence of the industrial character of the traders; and it is a question whether that contraband trade was more or less lawless than the "law" which forced it on the people as a necessary alternative to starvation. They had to keep their money in strong boxes till an outlet came, and then it was used in buying back those lands from which their fathers had been cast out for conscience sake—and forsooth in the name of free thought and private judgment—by those in whose favour an iniquty, which was nicknamed law, appropriated their property and annihilated their trade. On the other hand the smuggling trade enabled the French to do an extensive woollen trade in England—to do that thing which Ireland was dishonestly and deceitfully kept from doing. Verily, the laws of economics sometimes seem to work out the laws of God's Providence. However, let that be as it may; my purpose has been to point out the evidence of industrial life and character which the Irish people maintained even under terrible stress and trial.

Stanley writes*:—"In the 19th year of George II.'s reign, an Act was passed to prohibit the exportation of glass from Ireland, and, either to England, or to any other country, as the English manufacturers of glass were apprehensive of competition from some Irish establishments which, at that period, had been advanced to a prosperous condition." Ireland used to import glass from abroad; but as it was an article of general use, it opened an avenue of industry, and an extensive glass manufacture arose. But then there was a glass manufacture in England; and hence that law of 1746. Ireland was prohibited from exporting glass to any country—it was part of the Act that Irish glass was not to "be exported, or as much as to be laden on any horse or carriage with intent to be exported." That clause probably aimed at smuggling; and the mere packing glass in a cart, drawn up at the door of the factory, came within the meaning of the Act. And Ireland was also prohibited by the Act from importing glass from any country except from England. To put it plainly, a system of exclusive dealing in English-made glass was forced on Ireland by an Act of Parliament; and then the English manufacturers, whose influence forced on this exclusive dealing, forced up their prices when they had the market to themselves. Moreover, beer and malt made in Ireland were not allowed into England; but beer and malt made in England were sent to Ireland at a nominal duty. By an Act of Parliament made in 1711, only hops grown in England could be imported to Ireland; and an Act made in 1720 declared that the duty on hops exported from England should not be reduced in favour of Irish purchasers. Similar enactments repressed Irish manufacturers in cotton, silk, iron, hats, gunpowder, etc., according as they arose, or threatened to compete with similar industries in England. In fact, persons

*Loc. cit., page 133.

engaged in any industry in England had only to make known to Parliament their actual or impending grievance from a rival industry in Ireland, and an Act was passed according to their petition. In 1698 the fishermen of Folkestone and Aldborough complained to Parliament of the wrong they suffered from Irish fishermen "catching herrings at Waterford and Wexford, and sending them to the Straits"; and others petitioned that all fishing on the Irish coast should be prohibited except from boats built in England, and manned by English fishermen. What perversity and impudence it was for the people of Waterford to dare to catch fish in their own harbour! Really, Edmund Burke had much reason to ask, in a *Letter to Gentlemen in Bristol*, in 1778, when he was seeking to take off some of those restraints which had strangled every Irish industry according as it appeared to prosper:—"Is Ireland united to the Crown of Great Britain for no other purpose than that we should counteract the bounty of Providence in her favour? and in proportion as that bounty has been liberal that we are to regard it as an evil, which is to be met with in every sort of corrective."* And the author of *An Essay on the Trade of Ireland*,† wrote in 1729:—"I am sorry to find so universal a despondency amongst us in respect to trade. Men of all degrees give up the thought of improving our commerce, and conclude that the restrictions under which we are laid are so insurmountable that any attempt on that head would be vain and fruitless." And Froude‡ sums up the situation as follows:—"With their shipping destroyed by the Navigation Act, their woollen manufactures taken from them, their trade in all its branches crippled and confined, the single resource left to those of the Irish who still nourished dreams of improving their

* Burke, *On Irish Affairs*, edited by M. Arnold, page 101

† Quoted in Lecky, Vol. I., 180—*note*.

‡ *English in Ireland*, Vol. I., page 439.

unfortunate country was agriculture. The soil was at least their own, which needed only to be drained, cleared of weeds, and manured, to produce grass crops and corn crops as rich as the best in England. Here was employment for a population three times more numerous than as yet existed."

But let us see how the agricultural industry fared.

—o—

CHAPTER VIII.

IRISH CATHOLIC INDUSTRY—AGRICULTURE.

A LARGE part of the confiscated lands came into the possession of Englishmen. They continued to live in England, and acknowledged no relation to their estates in Ireland unless the right to take over rents and to spend them. The rest was put on the market and was bought by speculators; none of whom of course were Catholics, since the law held these incapable of owning land. Thus ownership in land was the monopoly of non-Catholics; and they became for the most part absentees, subletting their lands to middlemen on long leases, and with a security of tenure. Those middlemen were also non-Catholics; for Catholics were disabled by law from renting land except on short leases, never longer than thirty-one years. Thus the Catholics were reduced to the condition of cottiers. The absentee landlords gave no employment; industries, as we have seen, had been legislated out of the country; those who owned lands, as well as those who rented them with a fixity of tenure, held immense tracts which they turned into pastures as the cheapest and most profitable method of farming, when, after the peace of 1715, the ports of the Continent were open to Irish beef. Hence numerous evictions, which reduced the poor to absolute want. Hence arose a keen competition between the Catholics for such tenancies as the law left them capable of, high rents, short leases, and no security.

Having made that general sketch, I let Froude describe the process and the condition of affairs:—"The gentry hated labour. Everyone who could subsist in idleness

set himself up for a gentleman. Everyone who held a farm which he could divide and sublet, became a landlord and lived on his rents. The land was let, and underlet, and underlet again, till six rents had sometimes to be provided by the actual cultivator before he was allowed to feed himself and his family, whilst the proprietor and quasi-proprietor grew into the Irish blackguard, the racing, drinking, duelling, swearing squireen, the tyrant of the fair, the shame and scandal of the order to which he affected to belong."*

Thus "land-jobbing finished the ruin which the wars had left incomplete," and the middleman "pared the peasant to the bone."† And Lecky writes—"All real enterprise and industry amongst the Catholic tenants was destroyed by the law which placed strict bounds to their progress by providing that, if their profits exceeded one-third of the rent, the first Protestant who could prove the fact might take their farm."‡

But they could exert their energy, develop habits of industry and "strenuous qualities" by carefully cultivating such holdings as were allowed them? They could not, and they should not. They could not, for the simple reason that they were not allowed. I let Froude explain:—"The tenants were forbidden in their leases to break or plough the soil. The people no longer employed were driven away into holes and corners, and eked out a wretched subsistence by potato gardens, or by keeping starving cattle of their own on the neglected bogs. . . . Of corn, very little was grown anywhere in Ireland. It was imported from England, Holland, Italy, and France, but in quantities unequal to any sudden demand."‖ The wretchedness to

* *English in Ireland*, Vol. I., page 310.
† Froude, Vol. I., page 441.
‡ Vol. I., page 218.
‖ Loc. cit., Vol. I., page 441, seq.

which the people were reduced, as well as the fear of popular fury, at length woke up some animal feeling in the Irish Parliament, and in 1716 they passed a vote that "covenants which prohibited the breaking of the soil were impolitic, and should have no binding force." They also drafted a measure which would make every tenant to till at least five acres out of every hundred which he rented, and would secure a small bounty from the Government to encourage the growing and export of corn. They sent, as they had to do, the heads of the Bill to the English Parliament for approval. The answer which came back has the merit of bluntness, if not the merit of justice. It was simply this:—"The corn is supposed to be at so low a rate in Ireland in comparison with England, that an encouragement to the exportation of it would prejudice the English trade." The Lords Justices of Ireland reminded them that, instead of corn being cheap in Ireland, there was hardly any corn there at all, the best evidence of which was that large quantities of it were regularly imported from England and elsewhere. This rejoinder spoke to a fact which could not be denied, and had to be faced, but yet their selfishness was so deep that the fact could not obliterate the fear of competition, nor exorcise the demon of commercial jealousy. The Bill was finally sent back, approved with the reservation that they might withdraw the premiums at their pleasure, and the Irish Parliament refused to have any more to do with a measure which, to use the words of Froude, "had been mutilated into a mockery." "Their real motive for refusing approval was probably," says Froude,* "the same which had led to the suppression of the manufactures—the detestable opinion that to govern Ireland conveniently Ireland must be kept weak. Although the corn consumed in Ireland had been for many years im-

* Loc. cit., Vol. I., page 441.

ported, the English farmers were haunted with a terror of being undersold in their own and foreign markets by a country where labour was cheap."

Moreover, let us bear in mind that England had a monopoly of the woollen industry since the 'compact,' and the law of 1698. The larger the supply of wool which England had, the more cheaply she could manufacture woollens, and the more successfully could she compete with France and other countries; and consequently she thought that, instead of agriculture, the rich land of Ireland should be converted into a universal sheep-walk for the wool supply of her manufacturers.

As a matter of fact, these had been complaining that the supply from Ireland had recently become less. That was true, owing to the extensive smuggling trade which Ireland was carrying on with the Continent, which, increasing the wool supply of France, therefore cheapened French woollens in comparison with those of England, and thus secured an extensive sale for themselves amongst the English people. But the Irish Revenue Commissioners would not admit that which would condemn them of inefficiency; and their reports rather went to show that the Irish farmers, in their perversity, had lately taken to tillage and corn instead of to sheep-walks and wool. The truth was quite otherwise; but even the ghost of a grounded fear frightened the English Parliament, and they would not approve a measure in the interest of justice which might be against the interest of England. Of course, when those two interests collided the former should be elided to make way for the latter. Two centuries have passed since then, and the leopard has not changed his spots—he never will. However, a Bill was at length passed in 1727 which provided that a tenant should till at least five acres out of one hundred. But that law, as far as it affected the Catholic tenants, was practically useless, and as far as it affected the Pro-

testant tenants who had large farms and fixity of tenure, it was needless. These latter did not want it, because their interest and tendency was to pasture and cattle, due to the increasing demand for salt beef and butter for exportation and for the fleets; the former gained nothing by it, because their landlords still prevented them from "ploughing and breaking the soil," and being Catholics they had only landlord and anti-Catholic tribunals before which to seek redress. Thus the grazing lands grew apace; the commons on which the Catholic cottiers used to graze a cow or a goat, as well as the holdings which they rented, were absorbed into immense farms on which only a few scattered herdsmen lived. Grazing so grew and tillage so lessened that Primate Boulter wrote at this time that "in some of the finest land in Ireland you may travel for fifteen miles without meeting a house or a cornfield." There was sound sense in this sarcasm of Swift—"To bestow the whole kingdom on hay and mutton, and thereby drive out half the people who should eat their share, and force the rest to send sometimes as far as Egypt for bread to eat with it, is a most peculiar and distinguishing piece of public economy of which I have no comprehension."

I have said that the Catholics of Ireland could not put out their energies in agriculture any more than in manufactures; there was a legal obstacle. I have also said that they should not, even though they could; there was an economic difficulty.

Sir William Petty, writing in 1672 on the condition of the Catholics of Ireland, said:—"Their lazing seems to me to proceed rather from want of employment and encouragement to work than from the natural abundance of flegm in their bowels and blood. Why should they breed more cattle, since it is penal to import them into England? Why should they raise more commodities, since there are not merchants sufficiently stocked to take them,

nor provided with more pleasing foreign commodities to give in exchange for them? And how should merchants have stock since trade is prohibited and fettered by the Statutes of England?"*

The same economic instinct deadened agricultural energy amongst the Catholics at the time of which I now write.

Would any man of common sense trouble himself to improve his holding, knowing that if "his profit exceeded one-third of his rent the first Protestant who could prove the fact might take the farm" which he had fertilised with his sweat? Would any man of common sense waste his labour on land in which insecurity of tenure leaves him but a fugitive interest, knowing not whether the holding which he is improving to-day will not be taken from him and levelled away to form part of an immense grazing farm to-morrow? Even a Papist has not his centre of gravity so shifted into the next life as not to work in this life for profit; and it would "shock his economic sense," if he were asked or expected to work for loss.

Again, pasture lands were made exempt from tithes in 1735; which meant that Protestants as a body became exempt from them, and, as Froude says, "the burden of supporting the Protestant Church fell on the Catholic poor." The following extract from Lecky will sufficiently explain the position of the Catholics of those days with regard to tithes:—"The Irish tithe system was, indeed, one of the most absurd that can be conceived. Tithes in their original theory are not absolute property, but property assigned in trust for the discharge of certain public duties. In Ireland, when they were not appropriated by laymen, they were paid by an impoverished Catholic peasantry to a clergy who were op-

* *Political Anatomy of Ireland*, page 68. For which see Vol. II. of *Tracts and Treatises on Ireland*, reprinted in 1861.

posed to their religion, and usually not even resident amongst them, and they were paid in such a manner that the heaviest burden lay on the very class who were least able to bear it. It was a common thing for a parish to consist of some 4,000 or 5,000 acres of rich pasture land held by a prosperous grazier who had been rapidly amassing a large fortune through the increased price of cattle, and of 300 or 400 acres of inferior land occupied by a crowd of miserable cottiers. In accordance with the vote of the House of Commons in 1735, the former was exempted from the burden which was thrown on the latter. In Limerick, Tipperary, Clare, Meath, and Waterford, there were to be found, in the words of Arthur Young, 'the greatest graziers and cow-keepers perhaps in the world, some who rent and occupy from £3,000 to £10,000 a year . . . . the only occupiers in the Kingdom who have any considerable substance.' These men were free from the tithes which were extorted from the wretched potato plot which was the sole subsistence of the cottier. . . . The tithe-proctor who collected the tithes for the clergyman, and the tithe-farmer who bought them from him at a fixed rate, were amongst the worst figures in Irish life, and they were at the same time an inevitable product of the Irish ecclesiastical system. In the great majority of cases, the clergyman resorted to an agent, who often intercepted much the larger portion of what was paid. Sometimes the agent charged a percentage in addition to the tithe, and extorted it from the people. More commonly he paid a fixed sum to the clergyman, and recouped himself by a grinding tyranny of the tenants. Sometimes he sublet his agency for a fixed sum to a subordinate oppressor. Sometimes the cottiers who were unable to pay in full were obliged to give a bond bearing interest, and were in this manner soon reduced to absolute slavery. 'In some of the southern parts of Ire-

land,' said Grattan, in one of the tithe debates, 'the peasantry are made tributary to the tithe-farmer, draw home his corn, his hay, and his turf for nothing; give him their labour, their cars, and their horses at certain times of the year for nothing. These oppressions not only exist, but have acquired a formal and distinct appellation—tributes.' The cottier, it was said in a debate in 1787, often paid £7 an acre for land, received sixpence a day for his labour and paid eight shillings to twelve shillings for his tithes.''* Thus the tithes and the rents went on parallel lines, were in many cases engineered on the same farming principles, and the impoverished Catholics had to bear the brunt in all the ramifications of this legalised system of tyranny and wrong.

Arthur Dobbs,† frequently quoted by Lecky and Froude, says that "the discouragement to improvements arising from our present method of letting our lands by short leases of 21 years is obvious to all." At page 472, seq., he writes:—"Places where the number of Papists are great, it is plain, will never be improved; this is occasioned by the shortness of their leases." In the same context he tells us that Protestant bishops, in anticipation of promotion to another diocese from the diocese where they are placed, took fines for leases of three or four years. And he goes on:—"Have not tenants daily instances before them of landlords squandering away their time and money, and living above their fortunes, upon the prospect they have of retrieving their affairs at the expiration of such leases, by raising extraordinary fines, or setting their lands to those who offer most for them? Upon renewals, the improving tenant must pay for the landlords' extravagance a sum of money equivalent to the improvement he has made and the utmost value of the land, in case he has been so

* Lecky: loc. cit.

† *Essay on the Trade and Improvement of Ireland*, 1729; reprinted in *The Tracts and Treatises on Ireland* already mentioned.

provident as to have acquired any money, which seldom happens upon such tenures; or he must give a nominal great rent for the future if he renews his lease, otherwise the next person who offers a trifle more gets his land, and he is turned adrift, to serve in like manner the next whose lease is expired. Thus, where the landlord proves extravagant, he scarcely ever distinguishes between an improving and a non-improving tenant." He then describes how, when leases fell in, the fact was published at the chapels or market towns, and tenders of rents were invited and taken, just as contractors to-day send in sealed tenders for a building; and consequently the occupying tenant, in order to secure his tenancy, was forced to offer more than the value. And he proceeds —"If any tenant had been a greater improver than his neighbour, or had his houses and lands in better order, he was sure to be the sufferer. These have been the methods used by some agents to the ruin of the nation, by which means they give landlords a nominal rent-roll, and very often paid part of their rent with a mouthful of moonshine, by reason of tenants breaking and running off in arrears, whilst they themselves, by ways and means, get estates sometimes equal to those of their employers. . . . . How then can a tenant improve his land, when he is convinced that after all his care and toil, his improvements will be over-valued, and he be obliged to shift for himself? . . . . The want of tenure deprives them of sufficient encouragement for improvements and industry. The present short tenures only serve as a snare to induce the nobility and gentry to be extravagant, arbitrary, and sometimes tyrannical, and the commonalty to be dejected, despirited, and in a manner slaves in some places." Thus was all energy paralysed in the people, since, first in the shipping, then in the cattle trade, next in the woollen, then in the linen, then in the glass, cotton, hat, iron, and other manufactures,

and finally in agricultural industry—their last resource, every obstacle, legal and economic, was thrown in their way, and they were cast down spiritless and prostrate, without encouragement and without hope. No class, no race, would, or could even though they would, maintain a habit of industry under such conditions, unless they were a race of irreclaimable idiots. Now, I put this question straight to Sir Horace Plunkett—for, however I have criticised some of his expressions, I hope as respectfully as I would wish, I am thoroughly convinced that he is truthful and sincere—If you, Sir Horace, rented a farm under those conditions just described, would you purchase a plough or even a spade, waste a fraction of your energy or an hour of your time for the sake of improving that farm, excepting the plot on which you could raise as much potatoes as would keep away or kill the pangs of hunger in yourself and your little ones? I am sure I would not; it would "shock my economic sense." There is less economic philosophy in hunger and labour than in hunger and ease.

Yet, Berkeley, the Protestant Bishop of Cloyne, and a philosopher moreover, took it on himself to address the priests of Ireland in 1752, through a pamphlet entitled—*A Word to the Wise: or an Exhortation to the Roman Catholic Clergy of Ireland.* It has been reprinted in *Tracts and Treatises on Ireland*, from which I have already quoted. In that pamphlet he appeals to the priests to use their influence in rousing the Catholics from idleness to industry. Whilst reading it I could not make up my mind whether it spoke sarcasm or sincerity, irony or earnestness, or whether the reading of it tended to make me cry or laugh, to be angry or amused. I give the following extracts from it; which, to appreciate their proper meaning and purpose, must be read in the light of what I have written:—

"It is the want of industry that occasions all our

wants. There remains in the natives of this island a remarkable antipathy to labour. You, Gentlemen, can alone conquer their innate, hereditary sloth. Do you, then, as you love your country, exert yourselves"* "Having long observed and bewailed this wretched state of my countrymen, and the insufficiency of several methods set on foot to reclaim them, I have recourse to your Reverences, as the *dernier resort.*"† "Alas! how many incentives to industry offer themselves to the inhabitants in this island, crying aloud to the inhabitants for work! Roads to be repaired, fisheries on the coasts, plantations to be raised, manufactures improved, and above all, lands to be tilled and sowed with all sorts of grain. When so many circumstances provoke and animate your people to labour, when the laws, the magistrates, and the very country calls upon them, you cannot think it becomes you alone to be silent, or hindmost in every project for the public good. . . . There is small encouragement, say you, for them to build or plant upon another's land wherein they have only a temporary interest. To which I answer that life itself is temporary. . . It will be said that the hardness of the landlord cramps the industry of the tenant. But if rent be high and the landlord rigorous, there is more need for industry in the tenant. . . . Certainly, if I may advise you, you should in return for the lenity and indulgence of the Government, endeavour to make yourselves useful to the public."‡ "Many suspect your religion to be the cause of that notorious idleness which prevails so generally among the natives of this island, as if the Roman Catholic Faith was inconsistent with honest diligence in a man's calling. But, whoever considers the great spirit of industry that reigns in Flanders and France, and even beyond the Alps, must acknowledge this to be a groundless suspicion. In Pied-

* Page 208. † Page 209. ‡ Page 212.

mont and Genoa, in the Milanese and Venetian state, and indeed throughout all Lombardy, how well is the soil cultivated, what manufactures of silk, velvet and paper and other commodities flourish! The King of Sardinia will suffer no idle hands in his territories, no beggar to live by the sweat of another's brow; it has been made penal at Turin to relieve a strolling beggar. To which I might add that the person whose authority will be of the greatest weight to you, even the Pope himself, is at this day endeavouring to put new life into the trade and manufactures of his country."* Berkeley was, what is called in metaphysics, an idealist; that is, roughly speaking, he held that the external world was but one's own idea projected outwards and fixed outside one like a man's face in a looking-glass. I am not surprised. I could hardly save myself from idealism whilst I was reading those passages I have quoted from his pamphlet. It is hard to trust one's eyes to the reality of things when reading such cruel effrontery and untrammelled nonsense from the pen of a man of a singularly acute and powerful mind. But his economic idealism was in theory to be applied only to the Papists whom each Protestant soul in his diocese cost in tithes every year £10 a soul to save. In practice he pinned his faith to a princely income, to the extensive mensal lands which stretched out from his palace at Cloyne, to the four acres of a garden noted for fruit-culture, especially strawberries which his Lordship loved, to the surrounding shrubberies and the winding walks, some of them more than a quarter of a mile long, and adorned with hedges of myrtles, six feet high, planted by the bishop's own hand, or leading away among sequestered and over-hanging crags of limestone into caverns of unknown depth such as the imagination of the people might colonise with traditions of fairies, gob-

Page 221.

lins, and ghosts. I am merely giving a rough sketch of the place as described by one of Berkeley's immediate successors in a letter to Dr. Parr. Berkeley, the apostle of economics and industry to the Irish priests and people of his day, gave his services free and uncalled for; Berkeley, the Protestant bishop, enjoyed as large an income for doing nothing, as the Catholic bishop and all the priests of Cloyne together. Pity on those Papists who remained uninfluenced by his example of industry in cultivating strawberries and planting myrtle hedges! But why do I at all revive what was written so long ago? Because, as an expression of feeling, it is no better and no worse, but of a piece with similar counsels of insult and insincerity, which have been given to the priests and people of Ireland in unbroken succession down to this day.



CHAPTER IX.

HOW THEIR SUPERIORS OF THE "SIMPLER CHRISTIANITY" HAVE TRAINED IRISH CATHOLICS TO INDUSTRIAL HABITS BY WORD AND EXAMPLE.

LECKY writes:—"For reasons which have been often explained, Catholicism is, on the whole, less favourable to the industrial virtues than Protestantism, but yet the case of France, of Flanders, and of the Northern States of Italy, show that a very high standard of industry may, under favourable circumstances, be attained in a Catholic country. But, in Ireland the debilitating influence of numerous church holidays, and of a religious encouragement of mendicancy, was felt in a society in which employment was rare, intermittent, and miserably underpaid, and in which Catholic industry was legally deprived of its appropriate rewards. Very naturally, therefore, habits of gross and careless idleness prevailed which greatly aggravated the poverty of the nation. At the same time the class of middlemen or large leaseholders was naturally encouraged, for whilst they escaped some of the most serious evils of the landlord, they were guarded by the law from all Catholic competition, and accordingly possessed the advantage of monopoly. It was soon discovered that one of the easiest ways for a Protestant to make money was by taking a large tract of country from an absentee landlord at a long lease, and by letting it at rack-rents to Catholic cottiers." He is here writing of the condition of Irish Catholics at the time when Berkeley wrote. It is a clever amalgam of truth and falsehood, in which

anti-Catholic bigotry is glossed over with that apparent philosophic impartiality which Lecky affects. As between Catholicism and Protestantism generally, he is on the whole an impartial writer. But that does not absolve him from the stain of non-Catholic partiality. We must recollect that he was not a Protestant of the ordinary Anglican or Church-of-Ireland species. His Protestant doctrine of private judgment had led him to ignore the supernatural; and the form of Protestantism in which he thought he had found salvation was simple naturalism. He discusses every question which bears on Catholicism from a naturalistic standpoint, taking for granted that the Catholic principle as opposed to his own is for a certainty false, and then proceeds to discuss the consequences of the Catholic principle using his own as the criterion of his judgment—a most unfair and unphilosophic thing to do. Hence, whilst as between Catholicism and what is called orthodox Protestantism he is impartial on the whole, as between Catholicism and naturalism he is as keen a bigot as the rest of them. The same narrow philosophy pervades the writings of agnostics generally. They have a fundamental, positive, and definite doctrine, that man knows nothing about what is called the supernatural. If they themselves happen not to know it, let them by all means enjoy their agnosticism if they can; but when they say that it is "unknowable," they make their minds the measure of the minds of all men, including St. Thomas, Leibnitz, Pascal, Rosmini, and Brownson; and thus they assume their own personal conviction to be the criterion of truth. From the fact that they have passed beyond the stage of partiality towards the ordinary forms of orthodox Protestantism as against Catholicism, they pose before the public as the only men of disinterested investigation. They assume to have earned and to possess a monopoly of impartial criticism all round. The fact is that one can

find in agnosticism and naturalism bigots quite as blue as a Belfast Orangeman. They want the public to grant them a patent for impartiality because they impartially reject all principles except their own.

Burke called trade, commerce and manufactures, "the gods of the economical politicians." Thus to the mind of Lecky, Protestantism is preferable to Catholicism, inasmuch as it is more favourable to the industrial virtues; and having committed himself to that opinion he directly passes on to commit himself, even in the same sentence, to the same inconsistency to which Sir Horace Plunkett has committed himself. Indeed, the social economics of Sir Horace and himself are so closely allied that either they must have compared notes, or they sat under the same master, took away his teaching and wrote it down as their independent thinking; unless the case be that one of them borrowed his philosophy from the other.

As I have already shown, I am not, as a Catholic, at all concerned to prove that Catholicism is better or even equal to non-Catholicism of any kind in the matter of trade, commerce, manufactures, or making money. Those matters, of course, form part of human duty; but to take them as implying a philosophy of human life is as foolish as to take a fraction of a man's body for the whole. If the cases of France, Flanders, and Italy, show that a "a very high standard of industry may be attained in a Catholic country," what are those "favourable circumstances" which he wedges in as a necessary complement to Catholicism? Is it that they should be without an England to misgovern them? If so, what about those "industrial virtues" of Protestantism? Is it that they should start on their industrial career by rejecting the supernatural? If so, then his own cases, especially Belgium, belie his own principles. He and Sir Horace stand on the same turf-bank, and both tumble into the same bog-hole. The rest of the extract I have

just made, not to speak of what I have already quoted from him, ought not to have left it necessary for Lecky to seek "in the debilitating influence of numerous church holidays, and of a religious encouragement of mendicancy" for a supplementary cause of those "habits of gross and careless idleness," which he finds in the Irish Catholics of the eighteenth century. I will say nothing now about the Church holidays, except that he might have learned from the pamphlets of Dobbs or Sir Wm. Petty, which he often quotes, that the Church holidays in Ireland were not at all as numerous as in France, Flanders, or Italy; and yet he admits that these have prospered. Later on I shall have to say more on the subject in connection with similar diatribes made by Sir Horace Plunkett. But, why does he drag in "religious encouragement of mendicancy" as a cause of the habitual idleness of which he writes? He himself tells us that Catholics were evicted from their holdings and were driven in thousands from their homes, by middlemen, or by some one of the series of middlemen who came between the absentee landlord and the Catholic cottier, to be superseded by sheep or cows. He says "an inevitable consequence of the pressure of pasture upon population was an enormous increase of that nomadic pauperism which is one of the chief sources of national idleness and crime"; and elsewhere he tells us, as if with tears in his words, that they were driven to beggary. What then were they to do? The Poor Law system had not been yet introduced into Ireland, nor for a long time after; hence they could not go to the workhouse. Were they to turn foot-pads on the common, and appeal to force and the natural law for that extreme right to live which fraud and the civil law denied them? But that would "shock the economic sense"; it would scandalize the scientific consciences of naturalistic philosophers. The needy begged their bread

of those who, though poor, were better off than themselves; and because they were not driven from the door and left to starve in the name of economic science, the Catholic charity which was touched by their tales of distress and which relieved their wants is stigmatized as "a religious encouragement of mendicancy" and as a considerable cause of a great social evil.

Again he writes of the penal code that "it rendered absolutely impossible in Ireland the formation of that habit of instinctive and unreasoning reverence for law which is one of the most essential conditions of English civilisation, and, at the same time, by alienating the people from their Government, it made the ecclesiastical organization to which they belonged the real centre of their affections and their enthusiasm." That "instinctive and unreasoning reverence for law" has ever been, to the mind of Catholics, a consummation devoutly to be wished, provided that the law observe that distributive justice which has the sanction of a higher law than the law of the land. Hence, I do not recall the passage to differ from it, but merely to ask how does Lecky fall in with an "unreasoning reverence for law," whilst he falls out with an "unreasoning reverence" for religion? For, the attempt to fret away and undermine that "unreasoning reverence," which is the crown of the virtue of supernatural faith, forms the weft and woof of his *History of Rationalism*, and of his *History of European Morals;* and the same trend is betrayed on every occasion in the work with which I am now dealing. The penal code, he says, "made the Irish people the most fervent Catholics in Europe, but yet it was not without an injurious influence on the moral side of their religion. No class amongst them had such moral influence as the priests, but few classes have ever subsisted under more demoralising conditions. Springing for the most part from the peasant ranks, sharing their prejudices and

their passions, and depending absolutely on their contributions, miserably ignorant, and miserably poor, they were an illegal class compelled to associate with smugglers, robbers and privateers, to whose assistance they were often obliged to resort in order to escape the ministers of justice." If then the penal code "made the Irish people the most fervent Catholics in Europe," are we to conclude that, before the penal code inspired them, they had never merited any special distinction by the fervency of their faith? That is what his words plainly imply. I have no doubt that the penal laws had an accidental influence on their attachment to their faith. Virtue is both tested and improved by trial. But what Lecky implies in the passage is a misrepresentation of history as well as a misunderstanding of Catholic principles. What he means by the "injurious influence on the *moral* side of their religion" we may learn from these references to the action of the Catholics:—"Illegal combination was consecrated when it was essential to the performance of religious duty. . . . Eternal salvation, in the eyes of the great majority of the Irish, could only be obtained by a course of conduct condemned by the law." And that is the injurious influence on the *moral side* of their religion! They were so devoid of an "unreasoning reverence for the law which is one of the most essential conditions of English civilisation," that they dared to cling to their faith and to practise their religion in spite of it! And, like people, like priest.

And what are those demoralising conditions under which the Irish priests of those days subsisted? Why, here they are:—They sprung "for the most part from the peasant ranks"; which, by the way, is untrue in fact, as he might have learned from Sir Wm. Petty, who ought to know more about them than Lecky, since he was their contemporary. I find on page 65 of the pamphlet

to which Lecky often refers:—"The priests are chosen for the most part out of old Irish gentry, and thereby influence the people as well by their interest as by their office." I must not be understood as thinking this to be a circumstance of importance; the early apostles were not of consular rank, and yet the result of their labours was great; but Lecky should not ask the public to take fancy for fact. Again, "they shared the prejudices and the passions" of the people. Yes, I suppose that they had their "prejudices" against the condition of civil life under which they had to live; and by all accounts they did not piously hug their chains nor conceive an "unreasoning reverence" for the law that put them in shackles. Again, they "absolutely depended on the contributions" of the people, whilst they had several ways of escape from that position of dependence. They might have retired to the woods and starved; or they might have fled the country, and thus would have spared the ministers of the law the trouble which their presence gave; or, if they had only the "economic sense" to adopt the "simpler christianity" they would have secured the rich benefices which had once been theirs, but which that Christianity in its simplicity had absorbed. What Lecky evidently means is that the dependence of which he speaks so demoralised them that they did not use their influence in getting the people to respect the law—that law forsooth which made them outlaws. But they did use their influence in suppressing any social disorder which arose; and of their action in this regard, Lecky himself admits that they acted "with great uprightness and courage." They did not fail then, as they do not fail now, to do their duty; but it was not their duty to inculcate reverence for what was law in name, but iniquity in reality. Again, they "were miserably ignorant"; although their very disregard for the law secured for almost all of them

the advantage of an education in the Universities and Seminaries of France, Spain, and Italy. I presume that Lecky accepts their "ignorance" on the authority of Sir Wm. Petty, who says that "there is much superstition amongst them," because "they have a great opinion of holy wells, and of the cells of men reputed saints"—a superstition which was, and is, common to all Catholics. Again, "they were miserably poor." I admit it—to their honour, and to the shame of those who caused it. Although he informs us that they were "miserably poor," he informs us also that the Catholics "were ground to the dust by three great burdens—rack-rents paid, not to the landlord, but to the middleman; tithes paid to the clergy—often the absentee clergy—of the church to which they did not belong; and dues paid to their own priests." Now, if the dues paid to the priests were so large as to be associated with tithes and rack-rents, how could the priests be "miserably poor?" or, if they were "miserably poor," how could the dues paid to them be one of the three great burdens which ground the people to the dust? Of course the two do not fit together; but consistency does not count with Lecky any more than with Froude when contradictory statements come in as convenient missiles with which to pelt the priests. He cannot put this oppression of the people on the stage without bringing the priests into the play "armed with the terror of damnation," to use words which he borrows from Boulter, the Protestant Primate, and father of the Charter Schools. As a matter of fact, the vast majority of the priests of those days had no home, but went about amongst their scattered flocks, who gladly gave them hospitality—without "the terror of damnation"—an insult which Lecky might have spared the people for whom he affected sympathy. I also admit that it is "a demoralising condition" if we take the 'economic sense' for a moral code. Finally, they

"were an illegal class compelled to associate with smugglers, robbers, and privateers, to whose assistance they were often obliged to resort in order to escape the ministers of justice." Yet, in the same context he writes that "their conduct in many respects was very noble. The zeal with which they maintained the religious life of their flocks during the long period of persecution is beyond all praise." And after quoting the contrast which Spenser drew between their zeal and "the negligences of the idle ministers, the creatures of a corrupt patronage," he says that "they displayed the same fervid zeal in the days of the Cromwellian persecution, and during all the long period of the Penal Laws"; that "they were singularly free from moral scandals"; that "the strength of their principles was sufficiently shown by their almost unanimous refusal of the abjuration oath, and by the extreme paucity of conversions among them at a time when a large reward was offered for the apostacy of a priest." But all that does not justify them in his eyes, because "they were not disposed to set themselves in bold opposition to disloyalty," and "their influence, though sometimes exerted to save life and to repress disorder, has not on the whole been favourable to law." Loyalty to the law of the land is Lecky's supreme moral code. Now, loyalty is the spirit of obedience to law. But what law? The law that placed them outside its protection, and yet expected them to be loyal to it? The law that placed them in a position of disloyalty by placing them outside itself?

I have gone so much into this matter for the purpose of pointing out that the principles by which Lecky judges and censures the Irish priests and people of the 18th century have led Sir Horace Plunkett to judge and censure their successors of to-day. But let us return.

In the midst of the commercial, manufacturing, and

agricultural ruin which was made, pity for the neglected condition of Irish Catholics was stirred up in the philanthropic breasts of those who caused it, and inspired the establishment of schools for the technical training of those who had been left without an industry on which to practise when they were trained. At first sight it looks as great a mockery as some of our present technical schools. But the sacriligious dishonesty of the founders found a way out of that difficulty, for which the self-sacrificing honesty of Sir Horace Plunkett cannot find any parallel through our present difficulties. Their plan was as simple as their "simpler Christianity." I will let Froude explain it:—"In 1710, boys and girls who would become Protestants were taught to grow hemp and flax, and to spin, etc." That is how those philanthropists helped them to industrial habits. Then came the Charter Schools, founded in 1733, which the Protestant Bishop of Elphin, inspired by pious hope for the proselytism and Anglicization of the people, described "as English Protestant working schools established for English and national interests, from which little colonies, instructed in religion, and inured to labour from their tender years, might be sent out to cultivate the barren and neglected parts of the kingdom, and raise a spirit of industry and activity in the nation." Froude says that this Charter School system shows "a degree of practical intelligence as good as could be found in the most favoured parts of Europe. . . . The education itself was probably the very best which has ever been devised in modern times. Pity only that for so large a harvest there were but few reapers, and that the work that could be done was limited by restrictions of finance." But he adds—"the priests were furious."* Campbell, in his *Philosophical Tour in the South of Ireland*, says of the Catholics who boycotted those schools:—"Such is the bigotry of those deluded people,

* Vol. I., pages 575-577.

that nothing but absolute want could prevail on them to suffer their children to receive an education which, as they conceive, endangers their salvation"—There are philosophers to-day who also bewail the same "bigotry" in us, and almost daily chant the same threnody over our delusion. Will we Papists ever learn "economic sense"? Will we ever bring balm to the wounded spirit of our pious benefactors by transferring our "centre of gravity" from the next life and by fixing it in this? Yet Lecky assures us that "the system was set up, no doubt with the best intentions." And, notwithstanding the want of financial support which Froude deplores, they were supported by the Irish Parliament till the Union; and after the Union the English Parliament spent £675,707 on them in twenty-five years, till they literally died of physical and moral rottenness. In all, they cost the public £1,606,237, which is equal to about £8,000,000 at present; for the education of an average of about 1,800 pupils. Howard, in his *State of Prisons*, denounced them as dens of lies and deception on the part of those who controlled them, as dens of mental and religious ignorance and of moral and physical filth on the part of the unfortunate children who were decoyed into them. Even government, which had sustained them so long, could endure them no longer; and a Commission of Inquiry found that the children were half fed, were almost naked, were covered with vermin, that many of them at the age of twelve could neither read nor spell, that at an early age they were made to work in the fields for the profit of their masters. That is how they were trained to industry—and to save their souls!

So much for the manner in which our fellow-countrymen of the superior order sought to school the Irish Catholics of those days into "industrial virtues" and

"civic efficiencies." But 'the zeal of God's house had eaten them up.' They were not satisfied with word, they taught us also by example; and I will let Lecky tell how they did it. "The country gentry inherited traditions of violence, extravagance, and bigotry. Their relations to their tenantry were peculiarly demoralising. Men who in England would have been modest and laborious farmers, in Ireland sublet their land at rack-rents, kept miserable packs of half-starved hounds, wandered about from fair to fair and from race to race in laced coats, gambling, fighting, drinking, swearing, ravishing, and sporting, parading everywhere their contempt for honest labour, giving a tone of recklessness to every society in which they moved. The class of middlemen and squireens were utterly destitute of industrial virtues, and concentrated in themselves most of the distinctive vices of the Irish character. They were the chief agents in agrarian tyranny, and their pernicious influence on manners, in a country where the prohibition of manufactures had expatriated the most industrious classes and artificially checked the formation of industrial habits, can hardly be over-rated. They probably did more than any other class to sustain that race of extravagance which ran through all ranks above the level of the cottier, and that illiberal and semi-barbarous contempt for industrial pursuits, which was one of the greatest obstacles to national progress. False ideals, false standards of excellence, grew up among the people, and they came to look upon idleness and extravagance as noble things, upon parsimony, order, and industry as degrading to a gentleman."*

* Vol. I., 292, 293, 294.

CHAPTER X.

IRISH CATHOLIC MERCHANT INDUSTRY; IRISH INDUSTRY UNDER A HOME AND UNDER A FOREIGN PARLIAMENT.

From what I have written it appears plain that the Catholics of Ireland, even though they were "strenuous" Protestants instead of "uneconomic" Papists, could not have remained industrial by reason of the legalised manacles which tied their activity. If they had the will, they had not the way; and, from the description which Arthur Young and others have left us of the Protestant gentry of his time, it must be admitted that those who had the way had not the will. And setting the worst against the worst of each class, I think that the misguided peasants who, in white garments or blackened faces, flew for redress to the wild justice of revenge, had provocation and oppression to extenuate their guilt, in contrast to the wilful and dissolute lawlessness practised by the fashionable "Blasters" of the Hell-Fire Club.

The Penal laws had failed to force the Catholics into Protestantism; the Charter Schools and other institutions had failed to coax them into it. That stands in proof that they were a people of purpose and character. In industrial life, commerce, manufacture, and agriculture gave them no scope, and they were disabled from showing whether they were industrious or indolent. They were excluded from every profession, from every public office, high or low. They were excluded from the common rights to which the taxes they paid entitled them; and

they were burdened with taxes from which the Protestants were exempt. They had to pay double to the Militia, and if England happened to be at war with a Catholic nation they had to make good the damage done by the privateers of the enemy. Although, in the course of the 18th century, the law which forbade them to live in such cities as Limerick and Galway became a dead letter, they were not recognised as citizens of any corporate town. They were more than aliens in the land of their fathers and in the cities of their birth. They could not purchase property in the country, neither could they purchase it in the town. It is true that in commerce and in manufactures the Catholics and the non-Catholics of Ireland were crippled by the same restrictive laws; but even within that limited sphere of industrial life the position of the two was very different. Irish energy, in general, was tied down only in as far as it might come in conflict with English interests, but Irish Catholic energy had no play at all lest it should injure the interests of Irish Protestants. The well-known law which forbade a Catholic to possess a horse worth more than £5, and which empowered any Protestant discovering such to claim its ownership, was directed against their industrial progress. Such also was the purpose of the law which prohibited a Catholic tradesman from having more than two apprentices, and the most lucrative trades were long kept exclusively in the hands of Protestants by their refusing to take any Catholic apprentice. Even as tradesmen, merchants, or shopkeepers—the only industries which remained open to them—they laboured under many disadvantages. The direct action of the law did not affect them much in this respect, but it gave their Protestant competitors privileges and means of harassing them, through which they became the victims of many illegal disabilities. For instance, Catholic tradesmen or shopkeepers were not allowed to work at their trade or

to sell their goods in the cities or towns without the payment of an exorbitant tax peculiar to themselves, which was called quarterage. That was not a legal exaction; but they were driven to submit to it under threat of being summoned to take the oath of abjuration.* The cities and towns were ruled exclusively by Protestant corporations, and the Catholics had to take what they got, thankful that they were allowed to live at all. They were without a voice in municipal affairs far into the 19th century. And so late as 1812, Denys Scully, a well-known Catholic lawyer, in his *Statement of the Penal Laws*, a work of great ability which, though little known now, made a sensation when it appeared, complains that "Protestant merchants and traders possess decided local advantages over the Catholics, which frequently serve as substitutes for capital, skill, and industry; bestowing fictitious credit, personal respect, and undue priority of information. The number of Protestants thus favoured has been shown to amount to nearly 4,000, in the different cities and towns in Ireland. How severely must trade be oppressed, and its freedom coerced in a country where those persons monopolize all power, influnce, and public recommendation, enjoying (at the expense of the community) unquestioned authority, exemption from tolls, preference in the markets, and peculiar favour in all beneficial contracts within the influence or disposal of the crown, whilst, on the other hand, the Catholic merchant, tradesman, artisan, etc., is involved in a continual, but ineffectual, struggle against, not only the general severity of the Anti-Catholic system, but also the peculiar hardships and vexations attached to his lot, in his particular town. He sinks under the pressure of these accumulated burdens. He is debased by the galling ascendancy of privileged neighbours; depressed by partial imposts; undue preferences bestowed upon his

* Burke—*Tracts on the Popery Laws.*

competitor; a local inquisition; an uncertain and unequal measure of justice; fraud and favouritism daily and openly practised to his prejudice.

"This hostility is so virulent as to refuse employment to Catholic tradesmen, artisans, servants, &c., merely on account of their religion. Persons are to be found, even in the higher ranks of life, holding great offices or commands, deriving splendid incomes from the taxation of the Catholic people, who will not hire or employ any Catholic. They import their stewards, agents, tenants, gardeners, household servants from England, Scotland, Germany, Switzerland, rather than employ an Irish Catholic. They even pique themselves on this unnatural fastidiousness. The Irish prints abound with advertisements, and offers of various situations, stipulating for the Protestantism of the party as the chief recommendation. If any Protestant, foreigner or other, is to be had, he is preferred to the native Catholic.

"Thus the honest industry of Catholics is very generally damped and repressed, especially in the cities and towns. Those employments, indeed, which are beneath the sphere of Protestant ambition, such as day-labourers, etc., are still within the reach of Catholics; but no selection for beneficial occupation, no public reward or honour, cheers the Catholic artist or tradesman. His inducements to attain excellence are limited and scanty; whilst those of his Protestant neighbour are various and irresistable.

And in 1807, William Parnell, in his *Historical Apology for the Irish Catholics*, thus points out the ordinary and daily disabilities of Catholics:—"A Catholic suffers the three most poignant feelings that can touch the human heart. The Government of his country passes a vote of censure on him. His fellow-citizen expresses contempt for him, and expresses it with

impunity. The child of his affection blushes for him, and mourns for himself, when he learns that he necessarily inherits from his father a blot and a reproach, which no private virtues or mental endowments can obliterate or conceal. Not only a Protestant Lord looks down upon a Catholic Lord, and a Protestant gentleman upon a Catholic gentleman, but a Protestant peasant upon a Catholic peasant; and, in proportion as the degrading scale descends, the expression of contempt becomes more marked and gross."

Yet, in spite of quarterages, of unjust town rates, against which they had no means of redress, in spite of having no voice in the town council or market, of getting no fair play, of having to bear social and business disabilities in silence, the Catholic tradesmen, merchants, and shopkeepers of Dublin, Limerick, Cork, and Waterford, etc., were the ablest and wealthiest business men in their respective cities. Am I palming fancy for fact upon my readers? Let us see. Sir William Petty wrote:—"It is not to be denied that in Ireland, where the Roman religion is not authorised, there the professors thereof have a great part of the trade."*

The Protestant Archbishop King wrote in 1719:—"By the Act against Popery that hinders Papists to purchase land, they have turned themselves entirely to trade, and most of the trade of the kingdom is engrossed by them."

In 1739, the author of the pamphlet, *Some Considerations on the Laws which incapacitate Papists from Purchasing Land, etc.*, wrote:—"Papists being incapacitated either to purchase land, or to lend money on such securities, have engrossed to themselves a great share of the trade and commerce of this island, and of consequence annually come into possession of a considerable quantity of the wealth accruing to it." In 1741, the author of *A Dissertation on the Enlargement of Tillage*, warns the public that "the Papists are daily engrossing what little

* *Political Arithmetic*, page 118.

trade remains, and consequently the greatest part of our current cash into their own hands." On the strength of such evidence, Lecky admits that "in the Southern counties, at the time when the provision trade was flourishing, many Catholic merchants had acquired large fortunes and great local influence, and they exercised some indirect patronage over Protestants, and were the chief money-lenders in the island."* The indirect patronage and the money-lending arose in this way. The law had forbidden the Catholics to purchase land, and, as a corollary, to lend money on land securities, lest a Protestant debtor should have to yield up his land to his Catholic creditor. But things came to a dead-lock. The wild extravagance of the Protestant landowners, that race of "strenuous qualities" and "industrial virtues" swamped them in debt, and let their lands grow as wild as their owners. *Male parta, male dilabuntur.* Money should be raised somehow; and the Catholics, whose religion so sins against economic science as to "completely transfer the moral centre of gravity to the next life," were the chief possessors of ready cash in the country. The anti-Catholic economists found that they had made an economic mistake in forcing Catholics to invest their money in foreign securities, thus depriving the country of so much available cash. Hence it was not a growing spirit of tolerance towards the Catholics, as Lecky would have us believe, but their own desperate necessities made them, towards the close of the 18th century, gradually and under stringent conditions, permit Catholics to invest money in land, either in extended tenancy or in mortgage. But the process of yielding any rights to the Papists was painful and slow. Even so late as 1812, Denys Scully, in his once celebrated work from which I have already quoted, thus deplores the result of Catholic disabilities:—"The same misfortunes have prevented the return of many Irish families who have acquired large

* Loc. cit.

fortunes upon the Continent, in the Indies, or in the Colonies. Their valuable capital, experience, skill, industrious habits, enlarged views—what a treasure of improvement would they not yield to the native land of their possessors! For years past we have had opportunities of learning some interesting particulars of this nature; and we can affirm, without exaggeration, that during the last twenty years, capital, to the amount of not less than £4,000,000, with all its attendant benefits, would have been transferred to Ireland by Irish families residing upon the Continent and in the Colonies, if the Penal laws against the Catholics had not disgusted and deterred the proprietors.

"Some had actually reached London on their return to Ireland, for the purpose of purchasing estates, building dwelling houses, and settling in the land of their fathers. But, upon becoming apprized of the intolerance of its laws, system of government, and state of society, they have either stopped short in England, or returned, with breaking hearts, to resume their accustomed habits, and breathe their last complaints in foreign climes.'

Now, before leaving this part of my subject, I wish to invite Sir Horace by me, and, with those trade restrictions, town restrictions, quarterages, and the other disabilities which hampered the Catholic traders and shopkeepers of a century ago before our eyes, to beg him to answer his conscience the following simple questions:—Who were the men of economy, of industrial virtues, the men who saved money in those days? And, who were the spendthrifts, the idlers, the extravagant profligates, "the Irish blackguards"* and the "Blasters?"† Sir Horace, you don't know what gods you are!

* Froude—*The English in Ireland*, Vol. I., page 451. cf. Also Arthur Young—*Tour in Ireland;* Edited by A. H. Hutton, Vol. II., page 155.

† The name given to the members of the Hell-fire Club—a Society well worthy of either name, which was open only to those who

Shopkeeping, which was the only industry left to the Catholics, needed to have little concern for the Protestants. These had the land, the possession of which either in fee-simple or in tenancy was not only a source of wealth, but the *tessera* of respectability. But the want of commerce and manufactures was a grievance common to both. The legislation which had killed those industries in Ireland was more than a century old, when, to use a phrase which has been often expressed since, England's difficulty became Ireland's opportunity. England was trying to play with the American colonies the same game which she had played so successfully and so fatally in Ireland; but the colonists defied and defeated her, and American Independence was the result. Moreover, whilst she was occupied with her American troubles, she feared a French invasion of Ireland. The Irish, Catholics and Protestants, saw their opportunity, and they used it. In 1779 they started an Association, the object of which was to exclude the purchase and use of all such English manufactures as could be produced in Ireland. The ladies started a similar Association, which was more determined and destructive; because they resolved not only not to wear any goods except Irish, but they declared that they would "not permit the addresses of any of the other sex who are not equally zealous in the cause of their country." The result was that in one year the value of goods imported from England to Ireland fell from £2,000,000 to £595,000. The Irish Parliament met on October 24th, 1779, and passed this resolution: —"That it is not by temporary expedients, but by free trade alone, that this nation is now to be saved from impending ruin." The king's reply was indefinite, but they were not to be deceived. On November 4th the

claimed to be gentlemen, with the privilege of misconducting themselves. There were several houses in Dublin and over the country. The remains of one is still shown near the Falls of Doonas on the Shannon. There was one also in Askeaton, constructed in the old Abbey.

Volunteers marched to College Green, placed two pieces of cannon before King William's statue, bearing the inscription—"Free Trade, or this." England, in her difficulty, understood the force of that argument, and she was convinced at once. Within a month a Bill had passed through the British Parliament, had received the royal assent and had become law, permitting the free export of wool, woollens, and glass from Ireland. In the following month, another Bill was passed permitting free trade between Ireland and the colonies; and within two months more, another Bill was passed permitting the free importation into Ireland of hops, and allowing her to re-open her trade with the East. But those Acts were not a year old when England set about undoing their effects. The Lord Lieutenant was ordered to place an embargo on the export of provisions from Cork, and the English Privy Council reduced a duty which the Irish Parliament had put on refined sugar. It was plain to the Irish that a mere Act of Parliament was no protection, and that they would have the past century's experience over again, of pledges made and broken. The law which had given them free trade was a law made by the English Parliament; but the same Parliament might as easily unmake it. They saw no permanent security unless in a law made by an Irish Parliament. But the Irish Parliament was declared dependent on the English Parliament by the 6 George I., and consequently could not independently make a law. The only remedy was the radical one of making the Irish Parliament autonomous, so that it could independently make its own law, and regulate its own trade. On February 15th, 1782, the Volunteers assembled at Dungannon and declared that only the King Lords and Commons of Ireland can make laws for Ireland; moreover, that the ports of Ireland are open to all countries not at war with the king, and that any interference therewith except by authority

of the Irish Parliament is "unconstitutional, illegal, and a grievance." Behind those resolutions were 80,000 men, and more—logic that told like steel on an opponent in difficulties. That was the beginning of Grattan's Parliament. True, it was not an Irish Parliament. The Catholics formed the vast majority of the people; but no Catholic had a voice in that Parliament; no Catholic had a voice even in electing those who had a voice in it. It was a Protestant Parliament, the Parliament of a mere fraction of the Irish people. It was, however, the beginning of better things. But bigotry blinded them to even their own interests. If that so-called Irish Parliament at once set about consolidating its independence by sharing with the Catholic majority their rights of citizenship, it would have secured a popular affection and interest which would have made the Union impossible. Grattan pleaded for justice, but he spoke to deaf ears and stony hearts.

The free trade which was secured by the Volunteers and sustained by Grattan's Parliament is not to be understood in the sense in which we now understand free trade as opposed to protection. That is a species of free trade introduced by English economists about half a century ago. But the Irish Free Trade of 1782 meant freedom from trade restrictions imposed by England; it really implied protection from English legislative interference. Let us see what was the effect of it on Irish industries. During the 18 years of its existence, the Irish Parliament was chiefly engaged with the economic interests of the country. It does not come within the scope of my work to deal with the laws made during that time.* I have merely to point out the industrial progress made when the Irish people were once more free to work out their

* For a full account of these, see *The Commercial Relations of England and Ireland*, by Alice Effie Murray, D.Sc.—a work published last year.

own national salvation. But, let us see the results. The export of linen from Ireland in 1783 was 16,039,705 yards, valued at £1,069,313; in 1796 it was 46,705,319 yards, valued at £3,113, 687.

The following Table, which I take from O'Connell's speech on Repeal before the Dublin Corporation in 1843, shows the relative increase in England and Ireland of the consumption of tea, tobacco, wine, sugar, and coffee, from 1785 to the Union:—

Tea—Increase in Ireland ...	84	per cent.
,, ,, England ...	45	,,
From 1786 to 1800.		
Tobacco—Increase in Ireland ...	100	,,
,, ,, England ...	64	,,
From 1787 to 1800.		
Wine—Increase in Ireland ...	74	,,
,, ,, England ...	22	,,
From 1785 to 1800.		
Sugar—Increase in Ireland ...	57	,,
,, ,, England ...	53	,,
From 1784 to 1800.		
Coffee—Increase in Ireland ...	600	,,
,, ,, England ...	75	,,

That table points out the increased purchasing power of the Irish people from 1782 to 1800. The increase in the consumption of tea, especially in those days, was an evident sign of prosperity, for it was a very expensive article; and the increased consumption proves that persons in the humbler classes, who formerly could not afford to purchase it, gradually became prosperous enough to be able to enjoy that luxury. The table also shows that during that period Ireland became relatively more prosperous than England.

Let me now give the impressions of a few contemporaries. Lord Clare, in a speech which he made in

1798 and published, said:—"There is not a nation on the face of the habitable globe which has advanced in cultivation, in agriculture, in manufactures, with the same rapidity in the same period, as Ireland." And in 1798 Lord Grey drew a contrast between the slow improvement made by Scotland and the rapid progress made by Ireland:—"For a period of more than 40 years after the (Scotch) Union, Scotland exhibited no proofs of increased industry and rising wealth. Till 1748 there was no sensible advance of the commerce of Scotland. Several of her manufactures were not established till 60 years after the Union, and her principal branch of manufacture was not, I believe, set up till 1781. The abolition of the heritable jurisdictions was the first great measure that gave an impulse to the spirit of improvement in Scotland. Since that time the prosperity of Scotland has been considerable, but certainly not so great as that of Ireland has been within the same period."

In 1799 Lord Plunkett, in a speech against the Union, refers to "her revenues, her trade, her manufactures, thriving beyond the hope or the example of any other country of her extent; within these few years advancing with a rapidity astonishing even to herself."

Well, the Union came, and what was the result? In 1810, Mr. Hutton, the head of a great Dublin carriage manufactory, said in the Dublin Corporation—"Some of us remember this country as she was before we recovered and brought back our Constitution in 1782. We are reminded of it by the present period. Then, as now, our merchants were without trade, our shopkeepers without customers, our workmen without employment; then, as now, it became the universal feeling that nothing but the recovery of our rights would save us. Our rights were recovered; and how soon afterwards, indeed, as if by magic, plenty smiled upon us, and we soon became prosperous and happy."

I give another table which I take from O'Connell's speech, and which, like the former one, was prepared by Mr. Spring Rice, afterwards Lord Monteagle. It shows the relative consumption of tea, tobacco, wine, sugar, coffee, in England and Ireland in 1827, when the Union had time to produce its fruits.

Tea—Increase in England	...	25 per cent.
,, ,, ,, Ireland	...	24 ,,
Tobacco—Increase in England	...	27 ,,
,, Decrease in Ireland	...	37 ,,
Wine—Increase in England	...	24 ,,
,, Decrease in Ireland	...	45 ,,
Sugar—Increase in England	...	26 ,,
,, ,, ,, Ireland	...	16 ,,
Coffee—Increase in England	...	1,800 ,,
,, ,, ,, Ireland	...	400 ,,

Again, in 1800, there were 91 woollen manufacturers in Dublin, and 4,938 hands employed; in 1840 there were only 12 manufacturers, and 682 hands employed; in 1880, only 3 manufacturers in Dublin and around it. In 1800 there were 56 blanket manufacturers in Kilkenny, and 3,000 hands employed; in 1840, there were 12 manufacturers and 925 hands employed. In 1800 there were 900 hands employed on ratteens and friezes in Roscrea; in 1840 the industry had completely disappeared. In 1800 there were 1,000 flannel looms in Co. Wicklow; in 1840 there was not one. In 1800, there were 2,500 looms at work in Dublin for the manufacture of silk and poplin; in 1840, there were only 250. In 1800, there were 27,000 cotton workers in Belfast and around it; in 1840, there were only 12,000. In 1800, there were 61,075 tradesmen in Dublin for the woollen, silk, and cotton industries; in 1834, there were only 14,446; and of these 4,412 were idle, showing a decrease of 51,041 in the employed. *The Fall and Rise of Ireland*, a work

compiled in 1834 by W. J. Battersby as a Repeal Manual, is a magazine of statistics bearing on this subject. The few I have given sufficiently illustrate the decline of Irish industries after 1800. But the radical cause of the decline is to be found in the 6th Article of the Union, and in its application to Ireland by the British Parliament.* The infant manufacturers of Ireland were exposed, by the abolition of protective duties, to the overwhelming competition of the great capital and the long-established advantages of England.

The hope of Irish Catholics was again thrown back upon the land. But it was hoping against hope. During the eighteenth century, excessive rents, rather than evictions, constituted the main grievance of the Catholics. If they were serfs, they enjoyed to a large extent the privilege of serfdom—they were *adscripti glebæ*. The necessity of a serf for his master in most cases prevented eviction, as it often prevented also the strict enforcement of the Penal laws. When the 40s.-freeholders got the franchise in 1793, they became politically useful; for the importance and power of a landlord or a middleman was measured very much by the number of voters whom he could march to the hustings on election day. The multiplication of cottier tenants increased their political power as well as their rent-roll. And the 40s.-freeholder held under a life lease. But a change soon came. Leases were given during the wars with France, when prices were high, at rents which became impossible after 1815; and such leases became worse than useless, since the tenant could not pay. Again, after the elections of 1826 and 1828, the people began to vote not as machines, but as men. For which cause the franchise was raised to £10 in 1829, and the custom then crept in of not granting a lease to anyone whose valuation came within the

* The Articles of the Union are given in Battersby's work, from page 249 to 273.

franchise, if he could not be trusted to vote with his landlord.

The system of tenancy on leases gave place to tenancy-at-will; and the tenant, according as he used his political right, became either a serf or a victim. Before the Franchise Bill of 1850, the granting of leases had almost ceased.* At this time, as O'Connell stated in 1843, 10,500,000 acres were owned by Protestants, and only 645,000 were owned by Catholics, though the latter were ten times more numerous than the former. Again, after the introduction of the Poor Law in 1838, the landlords having to bear half the poor rate, and fearing the cost of the threatening increase of paupers,† began the process of what was called "clearing" their estates. I wonder is the word a metaphor taken from the practice of "clearing" new countries, by removing the forest-trees, the brushwood, and the wild beasts. Whatever be the etymology, the facts, according to M. G. Mulhall, are these‡:—

Evictions were most numerous immediately after the famine:—

Years.	Families.	Persons.
1837—50	263,000	1,841,000
1852—60	110,000	770,000
1861—70	70,000	329,000
1871—86	104,000	728,000

The number of persons evicted is equal to 75 per cent. of the actual population. No country, either in Europe or elsewhere, has suffered such wholesale extermination. Emigration since 1837 has amounted to a number equal to 84 per cent. of the present population.

1837—50	1,085,000
1851—60	1,231,000
1861—70	867,000
1871—86	1,003,000

* Cf. Butt—*Land Tenure in Ireland*, page 32.

† The Poor Inquiry Commissioners, in their 3rd Report, in 1836, say: "We cannot estimate the number of persons out of work and in distress during thirty weeks of the year, at less than 585,000, nor the number of persons dependent on them at less than 1,800,000; making in the whole 2,285,000."

‡ *Fifty Years' National Progress.*

Existing Irish settlements abroad, and the estimated wealth in their possession, show that the bulk of the emigrants were good citizens, of thrifty and industrious habits, viz. :—

United States ...	2,040,000	...	...	£388,000,000
Canada	1,053,000	...	...	£111,000,000
Australia	666,000	...	...	£132,000,000
Buenos Ayres ...	37,000	...	...	£18,000,000
Cape Colony, etc....	25,000	...	...	£6,000,000
	3,811,000			£655,000,000

In one generation, 4,000,000 emigrants, who left home penniless, have become possessed of real and personal property to the amount of £655,000,000 sterling, besides having sent home since 1851 a sum of £32,000,000.

Mulhall's book was written more than twenty years ago. That extract is a long one, but I have given it to save space; because it sets forth, on the authority of the greatest statistician of our time, the condition under which the Catholics have hitherto lived in Ireland. It also answers the charge which Sir Horace Plunkett makes against them of want of "character and *morale*," "self-reliance," "strenuous qualities," and the "civic virtues and efficiencies" of those who follow the "simpler Christianity."

When the sub-division of land and the multiplication of tenancies served them politically and financially, they sub-divided and multiplied. When they were forced to bear part of the burden of relieving the increasing destitution which their own avaricious economics had begotten, the sub-division of land was at once construed into a national evil, and the "consolidation of land," and the "system of clearances" became sacrosanct maxims in Irish agricultural economics, which it would be a sort of sacrilege to touch. Then came the new-born idea of "congested districts," and the patent remedy of emigration; as if a dozen tenants, the sole residents in a county, would not make that county economically "congested," if those dozen tenants were starved out by rack-

rents. In 1849 the Encumbered Estates Act came into operation. It was simply a Parliamentary plan for helping those who had not helped themselves. It provided encumbered land-owners with a cheap and easy way of transferring their property and of releasing themselves from the toils of debts which their extravagance had contracted. From October, 1849, to August, 1850, 1,085 cases of sale came before the Court of Commissioners in Dublin. In those 1,085 cases, the gross rental was £665,470, whilst the encumbrances amounted to £12,400,348. I introduce that fact in passing, merely to illustrate the example of thrift which that race and class of "civic virtues and efficiencies" gave the people. But the Act brought to the Catholic tenants only a change of masters. Some of the old race of landlords were kindly men, better than the spirit they inherited and the circumstances into which they were born; but the land-jobbers who in many cases superseded them had neither family tradition nor personal honour to relieve them. They came with the vices of speculators and the vulgarity of upstarts. Rack-rents and evictions went on worse than before; pay or quit was the grinding alternative which the Catholics had to face almost down to this day. This should explain to anyone who has the will to learn, why the Catholics of Ireland spent the nineteenth century at politics rather than at economics. Their *Catechism* taught them that the supernatural virtue of Faith is the foundation of Hope and Love; bitter experience taught them that, for themselves at any rate, only politics could make economics useful or possible. A people cannot practise economics on chimeras. Common sense told them not to spend more time or labour on their lands than they did spend. Insecurity discourages industry.

They had to pay fines for renewal of leases; rents were raised on the improvements made by their time, labour, and money; in other words, they would have to invest

their own capital, and pay rent on it. "Ye are idle, ye are idle," said the Egyptian taskmasters to their Hebrew serfs, when they failed to make bricks without straw.

Aubrey de Vere writes in the work which I have already quoted*:—"Of all the oppressions with which your England had afflicted this country, there was not one which, by means however various, did not tend towards a common end; and whether you proscribed her religion, or warred upon her morals; whether you made it her necessity to despise herself, or her duty to detest you; whether you engulfed her in apathy, or provoked her to rebellion; whether you assailed her with confiscations, or withheld from her rights; whether with plenary authority and the bell, book and candle of the State, you passed an interdict on her for ages, and committed her to darkness and the blank of outlawry; or imparted to her the perfidious and terrible gift of laws, restricting her legally from civil and religious privileges, when these first asserted themselves; from property, when property was enfranchised; from education, when knowledge moved abroad; from commerce, when commerce became a power in the world; the tendency of your versatile policy continued unchanged, and its result has been the reduction of this land to poverty. Poverty, the consummation which you had reached, and if not the chief grievance of Ireland, the joint product of all her wrongs, their concentrated and abiding representative record and result—poverty could not be moved by Catholic Emancipation. On the contrary, by the long denial of that just measure and the long struggle thus rendered necessary, a new evil was added to those already existing, a more rankling discontent, accompanied by a systematic agitation, less degrading than the servile content of the last century, but unfavourable to an advance in the peaceful arts, because inconsistent with staid expecta-

* *English Misrule and Irish Misdeeds*, pages 99-100, 101-102.

tions. The struggle for emancipation bred in the heart of this country a sorer, though not a deeper, wound, than fifty years of the penal laws. If this circumstance should surprise you, account for it by the fact that men may sleep in their chains and be unconscious of them, but that they feel those chains when they strain against them. That poverty, sir, still remains, though many of its original causes are abolished; and it looks up at you, demanding food, and inquiring of its parentage. I have detained you thus long on a painful subject, because if I can induce you to pore upon those significant characters graven by the foot of your country upon the breast of Ireland, I may spare you the trouble of reading a feeble commentary from my pen. You will not now ask me so pertinaciously why we are poor. It is because you impoverished us, confiscating property over and over again, incapacitating the great mass of the people from acquiring or bequeathing it, proscribing industry and fomenting mutual animosity and common insecurity. You will not ask me why the people are reproached for sloth; it is because there was no object for their energy; why they procrastinate—it is because there is no difference between to-day and to-morrow when each is a blank; why they bully you—it is because you bullied them, and failed to make them just concessions except on compulsion; why they are deficient in truth—it is because truth is the language of freedom; why they are lawless—it is because for three centuries they knew them too well; why they are reproached with levity—it is because they are not ennobled by the graver happiness that entails responsibility; why they do not love the memory of their masters—it is because they could not love it without hating all they are bound to love."

I conclude with this short dialogue between Luke Delmege, who brought over from England some humanitarian views which he mistook for wisdom, and one of

his parishioners, which Father Sheehan puts into their mouths:—

"But, Conor, apart from the question of sanitation, don't you think that a few flower beds would look better than that dismal swamp?"

"Of course, yer reverence, but we'd have to pay dear for them."

"Not at all. A few wall-flowers in spring, and a few tufts of primroses—there are thousands of them in the spring-time in the hedgrows—and a few simple geraniums in the summer, would not cost you one half-crown. Now, Lizzie, don't you agree with me?"

"I do, Father," Lizzie would say.

"So do I, yer reverence; but it isn't the cost of the flowers I'm thinkin' of, but the risin' of the rint. Every primrose would cost me a shillin'; and——"

"I thought that was all past and gone for ever?" said Luke. The poor man would shake his head.

"I daren't, yer reverence. Next year, I'm goin' into the Land Court agin; and, begor, the valuators and Commissioners would put it on, hot and heavy, if they saw a sign of improvement about the place.

"Good heavens!" Luke would say. "Then 'tis to your interest to drag everything back to prairie conditions, instead of improving house, land, and gardens."

"You've said it, yer reverence," said Conor.

I believe that there is more practical economics, and a keener insight into the philosophy of modern Irish history in those few sentences of "Conor" than in all Sir Horace's book.

CHAPTER XI.

THE ACTION OF IRISH PRIESTS IN THE TEMPORAL CONCERNS OF THE PEOPLE.

ANYONE who, after an absence of several years, returned to Ireland within the past decade must have noticed a considerable change for the better in the condition of the people. What is the cause? Industrialism? They have not shown much "character" as to industrial life; although in other respects they have proved themselves to be a people of very pronounced "character," inasmuch as they have survived at all, and have preserved those religious and national principles for which they have made so many sacrifices. That they have not displayed an industrial character is not a sign that they have not been industrious, but that they have not been fools. What, then, is the cause of the change? The action of the Department? No; but because land tenure is no longer precarious, and rent is no longer arbitary; no longer the result of an arrangement which was not an agreement but a forced contract. I have no business to criticise the new Purchase Act, and I do not think that my opinion of it would be worth publishing even though I gave it; but, at any rate, it has fixed a principle of land tenure which will put it in the power of every landowner to reap what he will sow, as to money, labour, and time. A peasant proprietary prevails over all the district of Abbeyfeale, a large parish in the west of Co. Limerick; and the appearance of improvement is already so visible that it promises a great transformation in the near future. That passing

of ownership has been going on gradually for some years, and all is due to the ceaseless endeavour of the parish priest for the past twenty years. I think that he would call his action political rather than industrial, although it has distinct industrial effects. He has been also, and for many years, closely identified with the Total Abstinence and the Gaelic movement. No representative of the Department, as far as I know, has ever gone there to enlighten him. No pioneer of any movement would be heeded in the neighbourhood without his patronage; not that he would oppose any well-meant project, but that any man, ecclesiastic or lay, politician or economist, who did not go there with his sanction and support would be beating the air. Now that he has a sound basis laid on which to build industrial life I have no doubt that he will give his support to any movement in which he will see the promise of benefit to his people.

I have referred to this case because it illustrates the action of the Irish priests generally with regard to the temporal affairs of the country. The material life of the people is not the business of a priest; it is brought within the sphere of his work only by the charity which should inspire him after he has provided for their spiritual life, to which he is in justice and in charity bound. If I asked Sir Horace Plunkett what is the religion of his economics, he would at once say "none;" but he will persist in asking: "What is the economics of your religion?" Why, it is sometimes asked by those who play at economics more vigorously than wisely, have not the priests done for the industrial life of Ireland what the priests have done with such signal success in Belgium, Westphalia, and Piedmont? For the plain reason that they had more "economic sense" than to follow the fool in the Gospel who built his house on sand:—" and the rain descended, and the

floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house; and it fell, and great was the fall of it."* What the "rain," and the "floods," and the "winds" have been in economic Ireland I have already pointed out in the historical review I have made. Everybody whose brain becomes possessed of a patent remedy for Irish ills thinks himself warranted to accuse the priests of neglecting the interests of their people, if they refuse to thoughtlessly accept and swallow his dose with their eyes shut and their mouths open, and to ask their flocks to follow and do likewise. Yes, indeed:—A man comes out, mounted on his hobby, and, taking for granted that he is right without considering even the possibility that he may be wrong, he thinks he is justified in blaming or abusing the priests for keeping the people in the background, if they do not at once place themselves, each at the head of a cavalcade of his parishioners, mounted on hobbies of the same breed, to exploit the showman. Let philanthropists who think they have a mission to the Irish people by all means use their civil right to promote it; but they have no right to trample on the reason of the priests on their way to the minds of the people, as if a priest must not use his judgment at all, but must misuse his influence with the people by at once getting a recognition from them for every well-meaning philanthropist who happens to think himself a philosopher. Newspapers, magazines, pamphlets, and books for the past fifty years, bear the tracks of disappointed Don Quixotes who have spurred their hobbies prancing through this country. I do not speak of the few "Catholics," more notorious than distinguished, who have never been known to do anything in the country unless to find fault with those who have done their best; who have failed even to make a decent living for themselves, and have taken to the less

* Matt. vi., 26, 27.

difficult but more profitable business of defaming their fellow-countrymen whom they pretend to protect from the priests.

From the early days of the O'Connell movement, when the Irish priest first appeared on the public platform after the penal times, his action in Irish public affairs has been down to the present day chiefly political. For that he has been called a "political priest" by those whose interested testimony testifies more to his power as a politician than against his character as a priest. In fact he has been usually between two fires. Whenever a new political movement was started, the priests, on account of the responsibility of their position and the consequence of their influence with the people, held aloof until they felt themselves morally justified in joining it. Meanwhile there were not wanting persons, not always of unimpeachable patriotism, who accused them of not caring for their flocks, and who incited the people to upbraid them with the same. In some cases the priests persisted in holding themselves aloof to the end, or in open opposition; in which event they have been accused by some politicians of "dictation," because they would not be dictated to by the said politicians, or because they told their people to discriminate between dictators and patriots. But whenever they joined such a movement they were accused by the other side of sinking the priest in the politician, of betraying their sacred trust as pastors, and of disregarding the moral interests of their people. They were "political priests"—but they would have been "non-political" if they had taken the opposite political side! In effect, they were to have no mind of their own as to the moral or temporal concerns of the people; in no case were they to be the judges of their own action. Their influence with the people was recognised, and they were coveted as machines wherewith to move the

people; to be cast aside like all machines when their work was done. Hence the attempts which have been made at every opportunity to undermine their influence over the people; because if their influence were lessened or destroyed their co-operation would no longer be needed, and neither politician nor economist would need to count on their opposition or their neutrality. As far as I know, the chief fault for which Irish priests have to examine their consciences for the past fifty years, is, not that they have followed their own judgment, but that they have in some instances mistaken for patriots persons who turned out to be place-hunters. However, that is an error of judgment in which all parties have had their share. It has been, and always will be, inevitable that priests and laymen alike have been and will be deceived by place-hunters disguised in the war-paint of patriots. The priests have, from time to time, been abused by persons of every party; have been abused for the side they happened to take by the party with whom they did not happen to side.

Quidquid delirant reges plectuntur Achivi.

Yet, the trust of the people in them has not been worn away or warped. Because, whatever the people may feel or say during the passion of popular excitement or under the inflammable oratory of parties, when the storm is over and the electricity has left the air, they recognise this as peculiar to the priests, that they can have no personal ambition to serve in the part they take; and it is only natural that those who consider the interests of the people as a whole would be blamed by those whose interests are centred in parties.

Sir Horace Plunkett writes*:—"I believe that the over-active part hitherto taken in politics by the priests is largely the outcome of the way in which Roman

* Page 118.

Catholics were treated in the past, and that this undesirable feature in Irish life will yield, and is already yielding, to the removal of the evils to which it owed its origin and in some measure its justification."

From what I have already written it rather follows, I think, that the part they have taken in politics is *entirely* the outcome of the way in which Roman Catholics were treated in the past. Till the storm of persecution subsided as the 18th century closed, neither the Catholic priests nor the Catholic laity interfered in the political affairs of their country; for the simple reason that they were not allowed. Late in the 18th century it was deliberately declared from the judicial bench that the law did not suppose such a being as a Catholic to live in the country. I ask the reader to pause for an instant over the iniquitous impudence and the grim humour of such a law running in a country which had been in the exclusive ownership of Celts and Catholics, in which even then they were five out of every six of the population, and of which they were made to bear in their poverty the main burden of the taxation. The law permitted them the privilege of paying everything and of saying nothing. Then came the dawn of their civil rights, not graciously given, but reluctantly forced by their irresistable determination—not a bad proof of the "*morale* and character" which had survived their serfdom. But they had few persons of education, except the priests, to lead or to stand by them on the political vantage-ground which they had newly obtained. If the priests did not stand by them, who was to speak for them? That "undesirable feature in Irish life" was then forced upon the priests by the persistent injustice of those who have never ceased to traduce them for forming it. It was a feature undesirable to the priests because under other circumstances it should not be their work; it was a feature undesirable to the despots, because it welded

the people into political unity, and their unity became a power which gradually forged onwards through the 19th century to the extended civil rights which we at present enjoy. Sir Horace is good enough to say that this undesirable feature owed its origin, and in *some measure* its justification, to the evils of the past. Now, why not *wholly* its justification? I hope that when Sir Horace examines that saving clause he will have light enough to see that, by intruding it, he is dealing out, in a halting way and by retail, those misrepresentations which others have been dispensing wholesale. I am not prepared to stand sponsor for every act and word done and said by every priest in the political arena during the long and desperate struggles of the last century, and often under circumstances of great provocation. I do not think that those priests who acted or spoke inconsiderately would stand sponsor for all they had done or said, when the heat of battle was over. The delicate position which they often had to take would test the meekness of St. Francis de Sales; and not to have made mistakes during the strifes in which they often had to engage would be as wonderful a phenomenon as we read of in the lives of the early apostles. What Sir Horace evidently means is that the priests should not have taken part in politics, notwithstanding the circumstances which called for their co-operation. I do not, of course, dispute his right to have his opinion. But I remind him that the priests themselves thought otherwise, that the Bishops who permitted them thought otherwise, that O'Connell thought otherwise, and that, at one trying epoch, Frederick Lucas, an Englishman, thought otherwise, and I may say died a martyr to the thought. At present I dare say that representative men like Sir Thomas Esmonde think otherwise. I may be answered that Sir Thomas is a politician, and has an axe to grind; but I rejoin that Sir Horace is an economist—and is the edge

of his axe all right? Between them all, what am I to think? I am not at all unmindful of the disadvantages and dangers to the priestly character which political strife contains. I myself have never been on a political platform, have never taken part in a political election, or written a political letter, have never been a member of a political association; but, paying, as I do, my share of the public taxes, bearing, as I do, my share of the duties of citizenship, if circumstances should at any time convince me that I ought in the interest of the people to take any political action which the law allows me, I would repel the impertinence of anyone who would dare to deny that civil right which I own and claim. I would not, though the law had not made me ineligible, allow myself to be elected on a County Council, unless circumstances made my presence there very pressing or useful, which, if I know myself, could hardly happen. Nevertheless, inasmuch as it implies an arbitrary power to limit my civil rights, I resent the action especially of those Catholic Irishmen who appealed to non-Catholic Englishmen in Parliament to penalize me for my priesthood. It is a curious irony that if I am a priest in Protestant England I may be elected on a County Council or on a Board of Guardians, but whilst I am here in Catholic Ireland the law makes me ineligible for either. I note the indignity contained in this newest penal law, for which it is only fair to acknowledge that Englishmen and Protestants are not much to blame. So much for the political aspect of my position. As to the religious or moral aspect, as long as my ecclesiastical superiors did not prohibit me, the views of economists on the religious and moral peril of Catholics involved in my political conduct would not bring much trouble to my conscience.

The action of the priests in public affairs has in the past been chiefly political, because they believed that

only through politics could any solid ground of hope be laid for the industrial and social betterment of the people. Sir Horace Plunkett gives it as his conclusion that the "immense power of the Irish Roman Catholic clergy has been singularly little abused."* But where he sums up his position towards them, he writes:—"While recognising to the full that large numbers of the Irish Roman Catholic clergy have in the past exercised undue influence in purely political questions, and, in many other matters, social, educational, and economic, have not, as I see things, been on the side of progress, I hold that their influence is now, more than ever before, essential for improving the condition of the most backward section of the population."† On which I observe that their purpose and influence, due or undue, on political questions has been to make economic progress possible. And will not their influence, which was "undue" in politics, be equally undue in economics? Yet, while it was, according to him, only "in some measure" justifiable in the former, he holds that it is not only justifiable but "essential" in the latter. But he does not explain how that which is a mistake and an evil in one case is not only useful but essential in the other. Economic projects for the prosperity of Ireland have been introduced off and on for many years; the priests have been asked to enter into them, and have been blamed and upbraided for declining to co-operate. I suppose that they used their own judgment, and thought the game not worth the candle. Rightly or wrongly those prescriptions were received or recommended by very few priests. But let us note the change that has come with the change in land tenure and rent-fixing. Just ten years ago the co-operative movement, known as the Irish Agricultural Organization Society, was started; and already

* Page 106. † Page 119.

over 800 societies are affiliated to it. In reference to that movement Sir Horace Plunkett, by whom it was chiefly initiated, writes*:—"I may mention that of the co-operative societies organized by the I.A.O.S., there are no fewer than 331 societies, of which the local priests are the Chairmen, while to my own knowledge during the summer and autumn of 1902, as many as 50,000 persons from all parts of Ireland were personally conducted over the exhibit of the Department of Agriculture and Technical Instruction at the Cork Exhibition by their local clergy." I write under correction, but I think that priests have already identified themselves with over 600 of those societies. Sir Horace and the organizers of the movement may be dissatisfied with that extent of clerical co-operation. They naturally would wish the clergy to take up the burden of every local society they thought well to start; but I think that the number which the priests have taken up within so short a time is surprisingly large. He was four years trying to set the movement going in Ulster before he could get any appreciable number to join it; and I believe I am right in saying that priests have been the first to heed him, and have been his best co-operators. We must recollect that it is one thing for a pioneer lecturer to enlighten a parish on the scope and nature of their local industrial possibilities, for an organizer to come after and point out how his theories are to be put into working shape; but it is another thing for the local priest, with the darkness of the past and the dimness of the future still influencing his people, knowing that they will blame him alone for having recommended them to try should the trial turn out a failure, to undertake the responsibility and to face the risk involved in the working out of the scheme. The man who states the principles and the man who does the

* Page 119.

details are placed quite differently, and the task of the latter is immeasurably the more delicate and difficult.

The lecturer who expounds principles knows not uncertainty, is impatient of any hesitation to set his project at work; and he is so far right; his principles may be quite certain. But in the detailed application of those principles to concrete circumstances, in the combination of local conflicting interests, there remains a great deal of uncertainty in the work, in spite of all the care and thought and tact which may be spent on it. The lecturer leaves the locality, having traced out the way; the priest stays behind with his people to painfully and cautiously tread it, every cross-roads bringing fresh difficulties and doubts. I could name instances where Sir Horace himself very much miscalculated the possibilities of projects which he had organized and guided. I do not recall them in blame; no great undertaking has ever been, or will ever be, without them; and I think it would be ungracious to throw in the face of a man who has done his best, the blunders he has made in the course of a vast industrial movement.

Besides those rural co-operative societies, the priests have also identified themselves with nearly all the industrial and technical work done in the cities and towns. And outside those industries which are worked under the patronage of the Department, there are some thriving ones which are worked by priests without any help from it, and there are some most successful ones which were started by priests before the Department was thought of, and are still under their control.

I have said that the promotion of political or industrial movements is not the business of a priest. Only special circumstances can make such works incumbent on him, and in those cases they are not a duty of justice but of charity. When priests in Ireland have, for reasons which seemed good to themselves, held aloof

from such movements they have been accused of disregarding the temporal interest of their people. When they have taken an active part in politics they have been sometimes and by some persons told that they have been going beyond the boundary of their rights, and when they have interested themselves in industrial work they have been sometimes reminded that they are not men of business; from which, it seems clear to me, that the presence of the priest in those movements is desiderated by some merely as a sort of lever, as an instrument to be used or rejected according as he serves or impedes their purpose. The priests of Ireland have never, and if I know them rightly they never will consent to be the shuttlecocks of any party in the affairs of their country. They bear civil burdens, and they claim civil rights. When, therefore, they interest themselves in political or industrial work they do so without saying "by your leave" to anybody. I assume, as a matter of course, that priests are not business men. Their training and life do not tend to habits of business in the technical sense of that expression. Yet some of them show remarkable business gifts and habits, and carry business transactions through with unqualified success. On the other hand, men who are supposed to be specialists not unfrequently show themselves remarkable only for causing confusion or failure in business transactions which they undertake. I now make a short review of some industrial works promoted by priests in Ireland; undertaken because of their necessity, and because those showed no care to initiate them who might have more fittingly done so.

In Galway, the Most Rev. Dr. M'Cormack and Father Dooley started a woollen industry. They provided or became responsible for more than half the capital, which was over £10,000. The concern is now worth more than double that amount after paying regularly a dividend of 7½ per cent. It has never received either money or coun-

sel from the Department, and yet it has been made a very successful undertaking, which is in a great measure due to the ability and care of the manager, who has been described to me as "a good Catholic, a good Irishman from Tipperary, and a total abstainer."

About two years ago the Bishop of Galway and Father Dooley also initiated a hosiery industry at their own exclusive expense. They applied to the Department for help, even for a loan at a moderate rate of interest, but they were refused both. This industry is still in its infancy, but it gives employment and fair wages to over thirty girls. Over eighty are employed in the woollen factory, of whom one earned 26s. and several earned £1 during the week before I made inquiry about its success.

About twenty years ago Father Dooley started a loan fund for the purpose of teaching thrift to the young, and of putting down the usury of the *gombeen* man. Sometimes as much as £4,000 is lent out of the fund in the course of a year. Last year they had 900 bank books out. The children deposit their pence or shillings, which are afterwards lent perhaps to their parents to buy clothes, provisions, a cow, or to pay rent. The money is lent on loan fund conditions. The capital in circulation is over £750. Besides that sum, over £2,000 is lent to the woollen factory, and invested in bank shares. Last year over £150 was paid in interest to the depositors, who received 5 per cent. on the money invested, and got the loan of money at 4 per cent. It seems a paradox, nevertheless a profit is made owing to Father Dooley's financial skill and care.

Now, the possibilities of a woollen factory which the Bishop and Father Dooley discovered in Galway, and which the Sisters of Charity discovered in Foxford, might be found by the Department in many parts of the country. Wool is plentiful, and the demand for the output of such a factory must be always certain. The chief con-

dition of success would be a competent manager—one who has a practical knowledge of the process in all its details. Such a manager would be much more efficient in a factory working on a small scale than one brought across the Channel, who had become a specialist in one or two departments of some immense English factory. The money which is unnecessarily spent by the Department in salaries or in the extravagance of the New College of Science would be enough to pay for the training of as many managers as would make successful woollen factories in parts of Ireland which are as neglected and poor as Foxford used to be.

I next turn to Kiltimagh, Co. Mayo. The parish priest is Father O'Hara, well known for many years in connection with every movement made in the interest of his people. He started a lace and dress-making industry about seven years ago, and now keeps 120 girls employed. From inquiries I have made, I learn that twelve of the best of them earned £250 last year; that if the girls gave their whole time to the work the average earning of each would be close on 10s. a week. The work has got neither counsel nor financial help from the Department, and nevertheless it has up to the present been a success. The Congested Districts Board, however, gave some help to build the school, paid a teacher, and helped to get a market for the work turned out. The Board showed that substantial interest in it before Father O'Hara became a member. About the same time that he began those industries he started an agricultural bank. He had borrowed money on solvent security from the Congested Districts Board to build artisans' dwellings. He built fourteen, and out of the profits of these, together with some help which he received from his friends at home and in America, he began the bank, and he now works it with £500 of a capital. He himself is manager,

and he gives up to £3 loans to applicants without bill, bail, or bond. Since he opened the Bank he has, as a matter of fact, never refused a loan to anyone, and in no case has the borrower failed to pay. In one case, owing to losses, sickness, and other unavoidable difficulties, the borrower has so far been a defaulter, but he has no doubt that the loan will be repaid as soon as payment will be in the power of the debtor.

The parish of Dromore embraces a village and a country district in the Co. Tyrone. Five years ago the emigration drain on its population was appalling; since then emigration from the district has wholly ceased. It is true, at least, to say that those who emigrate from Dromore at present—and they are very few—are persons who are not likely to improve their position in, or to be a useful acquisition to their adopted country. Some important factors must have come into play to work so great a change in so short a time. The chief factor is the presence of Father Maguire, C.C., and the next is the school of lace, crochet, and kindred industries which was opened in the place little more than four years ago. The industry was started in September, 1901, with the valuable counsel of Father Finlay, S.J , representing the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society The industry has been carried on from the beginning as a Co-operative Society, so that each girl receives the whole price of her work instead of a stipulated wage That mostly accounts for the fact that the girls, although they have in many cses to travel long distances, are as earnest in the work now as in the beginning; because each worker regards the success or failure of the industry as her own, and realises the necessity of meeting the expectations of purchasers in every consignment of goods to which her name is attached. The system on which the industry is worked really brings about a competition between the workers, for each one's credit in the eyes of the public is involved

in the work she turns out, and for which she is paid according to its merits.

The beginnings of the industry were very humble. At first the work went on partly in the courthouse, kindly lent by the local magistrates, and partly in a few rooms in which a large number of lace and crochet-workers were huddled together. But from the start it had the patronage of the Irish Agricultural Organisation Society, and the active friendship of Father Finlay, who procured for it competent teachers through the Department. The girls themselves saw their interest in it, the people of the district saw reality in it, and with their support, together with money set aside from the profits of the industry itself, the girls are now provided with spacious and suitable work-rooms. Last year they earned over £1,000, which is a great deal, since many of the workers use the industry only as a supplement to their home duties I quote the following from the report of the public auditor who, as required by law, examined the accounts of the Society last year :—"You are giving, under the prudent and vigorous direction of Rev. Father Maguire, occupation in skilled, dignified, and profitable labour to 100 employees, who are all members of the Society. You have introduced into your district, and are conducting on sound, practical lines, an industry which seems destined to become a prominent factor, direct and indirect, of prosperity for the country. This enterprise and example are worthy of unstinted admiration, and I trust will command what you probably regard as a better reward—unstinted success. I am glad to be able to report that your accounts have been kept with business-like system and accuracy."

The industry which I have thus briefly reviewed supplements the incomes of the families to which the workers belong. It gives them the means of making money. But an increased income does not always bring increased

comfort to a family. Money is only a means to an end. A wise man makes money for the sake of his personal comfort; he is a fool who inverts the order of nature by sacrificing his comfort for the sake of making money. But, setting aside that extreme of foolishness, I think it is true to say that in ordinary home arrangements it is more important for personal or family comfort to know how to spend money than to know how to make it. I can illustrate the truth from experience:—I know families who live in frugal comfort on 15s. a week, and I know families who live in slovenly discomfort on twice that income. Father Maguire has realised that truth, and is at present occupied in solving the problem which it involves. Since the building was erected for his lace and crochet industry, Domestic Economy in all its branches has been taught in it, in order that actual or prospective housekeepers might learn how to make short incomes go a long way. But according as the pupils who attended the lectures learned the secrets of domestic economy, the problem arose:—How many of them will carry the theory of the school into the practice of their homes? Sir Horace Plunkett has recognised that there is not a necessary connection between the two, and he has enabled Father Maguire to have the teaching of the school carried into the homes of the people one by one. On July 30th, 1904, Father Finlay went to Dromore to inaugurate this new departure, and Miss O'Conor Eccles remained there to put the scheme into effect, going from house to house, and employing the utensils which each family could afford. Amongst the schemes which Sir Horace has at least done his best to promote, I believe that not one will have more beneficial and far-reaching consequences than that one. *Chi va piano va sano, e chi va sano va lontano,* is a proverb in common use with the Italians. This new system of teaching domestic economy is slow, but sure. It will take time to spread over the

country; but it will help to propagate itself; because it will be contagious in whatever district its benefits are seen.

Baltimore is a village on a headland jutting out into the Atlantic from the Southern coast of Co. Cork. Cut away from the mainland by a narrow sound are Hare, Skerkin, and Clear Island. Before the "bad times," as the famine years are commonly called by the people, the inhabitants of Baltimore and its neighbourhood managed, by fishing along the coast, to pay heavy rents for the use of plots of poor land on which they grew patches of potatoes and corn. For a remote place they had a considerable fishing fleet. But "black '47" brought the blight to more than their staple food. It wiped out the young and the strong, the bread-winners of the place. The inhabitants of the islands off the coast crowded into Skibbereen, in hopes of saving themselves from starvation and death. Some got temporary employment at road-making under the Board of Works, but many died of hunger or of the famine-fever, and were buried in a common grave which can to-day be identified by a grass-grown mound. It serves as a memorial of their martyrdom, for they were the victims of duty disowned by those in power till it was too late to save them. Of those who survived, the emigrant ship took away many who used to man their little crafts along the coast. A visitor to the place thus describes what he saw there in 1863:—"When I first visited Cape Clear, a couple of hookers and small rowing boats were all that remained of what had been a respectable fishing fleet. Beside there were only to be seen a few wrecks lying on the strand at North Harbour, with the green sea-weed climbing over their mouldering timber. Vessels, nets, gear—all went in the agony of craving for food at any price, and in the period succeeding there were no means to replace them, and it seemed even as

if the energy to desire their replacement was wanting,"* Father Leader, who was then parish priest of the district, enlisted the sympathy of the Baroness Burdett-Coutts in favour of the people. Besides giving temporary relief she helped a number of them across to Canada, and gave them the means of following their avocation of fishermen. It is strange that they had to cross the Atlantic to catch fish whilst they had them in shoals almost at their feet along their native coast. Yet it had to be so, and their benefactress did what seemed best to her under the circumstances.

The threatenings of famine appeared again in 1879. Those in power were warned in time of what was coming, but they heeded not the warning. Father Leader had died some years before, and Father Davis, who was now parish priest of Baltimore, saw in sadness the doom of his people. His forecast of the impending ruin was all the more painful, because the famine could so easily be fought and kept away from them by the means of living, even of prosperity, which daily came up to their very doors if they only had the power to use them. It was the old story; nature was a kind mother, but Government officialdom was a Sarah Gamp. There was the wide ocean expanding before them and teeming with fish, but they needed the appliances, the boats and the nets, to catch them; and what made their position more pitiful was that they had to look on helplessly and hopelessly as the teeming shoals were shipped away to England, Scotland, the Isle of Man, to France, and even to Norway, whence fishermen came to catch them. To adopt the words of *The Saturday Review*† :—"Until a few years ago the people of the coast looked on while others took the fish and made the profits. This neglect was not due to any ignorance of the value of what is

* *Cork Examiner*, August 27th, 1887.
† Oct. 15th, 1887.

poetically called the harvest of the sea. Irishmen talked freely about the fisheries they ought to be able to work if insurmountable obstacles of some kind did not get in the way. It was not even due to want of the wish to encourage the fishermen on the part of the Government. Money has been specially voted for the purpose; but unfortunately, it has gone, as money has a trick of going in Ireland, on harbours which serve no purpose, on public works which never came to anything, and labour which was temporarily profitable to the labourer." Whilst the poor people were lying fallow, without help and even without hope, Father Davis set about lifting them up, as the statesmen whose duty it was to provide them with the means, and the scientific economists who affect exclusive ability to direct them, were leaving them to their fate. One who knew Father Davis and his work well, once wrote to me that "his chief merit seems to have been that he saw and understood the capabilities of the South Coast fisherman, and knew that if the poor fellow got a chance he would hold his own with the foreigner, whether French, English, Scotch, or Manx. But the Joint Stock Banks of this country, conducted as they were by professional economists, set no value on the industry, honesty, and ability of the local fisherman. It was reserved for an English lady to lend a helping hand, at the request of Father Davis, and, accordingly, the Baroness Burdett-Coutts placed £10,000 to the credit of Father Davis, and asked him to undertake the distribution of it among the fishermen, and so enable them to obtain boats and nets on favourable terms. He undertook what was supposed by many to be a thankless job; but he knew his men, lent them according to their wants, and generally to supplement their own endeavours; he was repaid the loans in due time, which repayments were of course lodged to the credit of the Baroness. That

in short was the beginning of the Baltimore fishing industry." She stipulated only for the repayment of the loan by annual instalments; but she required no interest, and no security; and, according to *The Times*‡:—"Not only has her benevolence produced prosperity, but her confidence in the honour of the poor people has been amply justified. The annual instalments have been punctually paid, except where, as last year, the Baroness herself has offered a temporary remission on account of an exceptionally bad season. Those whom she thus helped, have thus helped themselves, and falsified all predictions that they would be pauperised by philanthropy." I quote the following from *The Weekly Despatch*§:—"Whilst all the statesmen, and politicians, and 'inspectors,' and experts have been talking about reviving fishing industries in Ireland, the Baroness has, as Mr. Squeers would say, 'simply gone and done it.' And how has she done it? Why, by trusting the people to carry out her benevolent scheme in their own way by agents they trust, and who are not imported by her from England to bully and worry them. She has given the lie to the fallacy of centuries, which says that the Irish do not work their fisheries because they are idle. She advanced money to the Baltimore men to buy proper boats and nets, and to get a decent harbour. She put the management of the thing in the hands of the excellent Father Davis, their priest. She has never patronised or pestered them, and behold the result. In spite of her blatant Toryism, when she goes among them she is received like a queen. Not a penny has she ever lost by them. . . . That one old English lady can do so much by simply acting on Home Rule principles in regard to her charities in Ireland is a terrible satire on Castle Government." Everything was

‡ Aug. 18th, 1887.
§ Aug. 21st, 1887.

done under the direction of Father Davis. The Fishery Board afterwards made advances, and the Congested Districts Board which has succeeded it; but neither of them has lost one penny by their loans. There is now in the island of Cape Clear, the population of which is about 600, a fleet of three schooners engaged in the coasting trade, 24 large decked fishing boats, each carrying seven men, and nearly all supplied with steam gear for hauling their nets at sea, and about 50 large open sailing yawls, five to seven-ton boats, which are chiefly used for autumn fishing when the mackerel are nearer the land than in the spring of the year. This property in boats, gear, and nets all created within the past 25 years, is worth up to £20,000.

But Father Davis saw that it was not enough for fishermen to have boats. They must know how to make and repair them, to make and mend nets, to cure and keep fish; they must have all those trades which are associated with the fishing industry, such as carpentering, coopering, net, rope, line, and sail-making. In a paper of interest which he read in 1886 before the Cork Literary and Scientific Society he said that he remembered "the pleasant whir of the humble rope-maker's wheel in many of our sea-side villages." But at the time he was speaking nearly all the fishing gear used in Ireland had to be imported from abroad. To remedy that defect, the Baltimore Fishery School, owing to his representation and influence, was opened in the autumn of the following year by the aid of a grant from Government, from the Co. Cork Grand Jury, and many munificent subscriptions from private sources. If the original idea was carried out, the school should have borne far-reaching results for the fishing industry of the country. It was placed under the Industrial Schools' Act in order to secure an income for the maintenance of pupils who came from a distance.

A promise was given on behalf of the Government that children from the sea-coast who were subjects for an Industrial School would be sent there; but it turned out that legislation was necessary for that arrangement, and nothing was done to do away with the obstacle. But this piece of patchwork was proposed: that children be sent as usual to Industrial Schools, but that an exchange process should go on: inland-born children to be transferred to other schools in exchange for coast-born children to be transferred from other schools to Baltimore. Like many another project designed by draft-scheme economists, it worked out all right on paper, but it worked confusion in practice. Father Davis had charge of it for five years, and in spite of those difficulties left it in a sound financial and working condition in 1892, when God called him away from his work on earth. For the next five years it was chiefly under the control of "experts," with the result that it was run hopelessly into debt and to the brink of ruin. If I remember rightly, it was talked of as about to be closed. But a young priest, with his "centre of gravity in a future existence," consented to leave his parish work in order to take over the management of it, to work it on strict business lines—Paradox! oh, you experts and economists! As far as I am aware, Father Hill has not appealed to any source outside the income of the school itself for financial help out of his difficulties, yet I am told, on what I consider reliable authority, that not only has the debt which stared him six years ago when he took it over been already paid off, but that the work itself has been extended. At any rate, according to the report of the Industrial Schools' Inspector, the boys of the Baltimore School are well cared for, the technical work of the school is kept going at a heavy yearly expense, and I know that the boats and nets which are made

there are known all round the Irish coast from Berehaven to Donegal. Considering the special purpose for which it was founded, it is plain that it should never have been subject to the Industrial Schools Act which determines the boys who are sent there. But the cast-iron of the law would not be moulded.

There are about 2,500 miles of coast-line in Ireland, and there is potential prosperity for the people along every mile of it. Foreigners by the thousand realise it and make a living out of it. The fish are there; it is only a question of catching and curing them. Irish fishermen are not ignorant of that source of wealth which nature throws up daily before their doors; but without large boats they cannot venture far out into the ocean, and these cannot be built for less than £400 or £500 each. Again, Ireland once did a flourishing trade in the export of cured fish; but it has become extinct, and improved methods of fish-curing have meanwhile come into use. At present Ireland does not even supply herself with cured fish. According to Father Davis—"In the year 1883 we find Scotland alone sending us 25,870 barrels of herrings and 36,000 cwt. of cod, and it has been stated with every appearance of truth that portion of this fish had been actually captured on our coast, cured in Scotland, and sent back for our use. It has been ascertained that the price of fish cured in other countries annually imported into Ireland exceeds a quarter of a million pounds sterling." * Pilchards, with which Dungarvan habour teems, are not used in these countries; but foreign fishermen take them away and find a market for them in Italy. Want of suitable boats, want of technical training according to the improved methods which have arisen since the fishing industry

*"Deep Sea Fisheries in Ireland." By Rev. Charles Davis, P.P. Page 23. Cf. also "History and Position of the Sea Fisheries of Ireland, and how they may be made to afford food and employment." By John A. Blake, M.P., 1868. Printed for private circulation.

flourished in Ireland, and our exorbitant Railway tariffs and cost of transit generally make up the triple difficulty which Father Davis set himself to solve, beginning at Baltimore. Who is going to solve it over the 2,500 miles of Irish coast-line? Is every priest along the coast to go looking for a benefactress like the Baroness Burdett-Coutts for the loan of money to build boats for the fishermen of his parish? It would be an easy way of shirking a duty which others are bound to do. We are so accustomed to see the priest do so much for the temporal concerns of the people that we have thoughtlessly fallen into the conclusion that to do so is part of his functions. Some critics seem to think, when something has to be done for the temporal interests of the people, that the priest exists for no other purpose on earth except to take and do it; that is, until he has done it, and then they tell us he has no business to meddle with it, in fact, does not know anything about it; that these things should be left to experts or economists. Well, their work is cut out for them along 2,500 miles of Irish coast-line; let them take and do it. I do not at all think that it is part of the functions of Government to become a sort of national nurse to the people. But it is plainly its duty to set the nursery in order. Much money is wasted, at least is risked, on problematical schemes from which theorists argue *a priori* that consequences of far-reaching national importance should follow; and so they should follow, perhaps, although they usually do not. But in the fishery question it is all plain sailing, if the fishermen had the boats. Why should not the Department help to solve the question? Father Davis, in great measure, solved it, for Baltimore, and would probably have solved it wholly had he lived.

I now pass across to the Aran Islands, where the chief industry of the inhabitants is fishing. Not many years

ago the industry was almost neglected. As was the case at Baltimore, their fortune was at their feet and surrounded them on every side, but they were powerless to utilise and enjoy it. Father O'Donoghue, who was parish priest of the islands some years ago, after having made many efforts in vain to get the Government even to consider the matter, at length induced them to help in promoting the industry. One of the chief initial difficulties was to get the people to realise its possibilities and to feel their power to help themselves. Some spasmodic efforts had already been made, but they failed for want of sufficient external aid, and the Islanders were not disposed, even with the promised help of the Congested Districts Board, to place much hope in another venture. Persuaded by past failures of their powerlessness they had lost all hope. Father Farragher, the present parish priest, who was then Father O'Donoghue's assistant, suggested this simple and effective way of convincing them. Fishermen from Arklow were brought to the place, but they could not induce one of the Islanders to man their boats; in fact, they jeered at the new-comers and ridiculed what they thought to be an idle project. But directly they witnessed the successful hauls of fish, what they saw done at once convinced them of what they could do; their possibilities and their hopes came back; their fishing propensity prevailed and led them to the work. It was the initial revival of the Aran fishing industry. The Islanders became steady and successful fishermen; the industry has gradually grown since then, and at present all the Islanders are interested in its success, because those who do not themselves fish are employed for work on their plots of land by those who do. Father Farragher, probably, would not call himself an expert in the fishing industry, but from his long and constant residence in Aran I am told that he understands it much better than most of the experts. He might be called the captain of

the Aran fishing fleet. He counsels and directs the fishermen in every undertaking. The Congested Districts Board, without whose aid he would of course have been powerless, have sense enough to see that although a priest he is competent to advise, and they invariably follow his advice. Hence they spend very little on red-tape, draft-schemes, itinerant experts, and "improved methods," in connection with the Aran fisheries; and their true economic sense is rewarded by the result that the turn over of the industry varies from £6,000 to £8,000 a year. There is also a boat-building yard, whence the fishermen are supplied and where boys are taught. Young men and boys are also taught to make and mend nets, to clean and cure fish, and the other arts by which the fishing trade is equipped. There is also an Agricultural Bank, of which Father Farragher is founder and chairman. All those works have been carried on under the patronage of the Congested Districts Board, without whose help they would of course have been impossible. The agricultural work of the Congested Districts Board, as far as regards cottage gardening and the breeding of animals, has been for some time transferred to the control of the Department; and I think I am correct in saying that since then those industries have either ceased or remained undeveloped, so far as the Department has taken any interest in them.

I came to know a few years ago of the work done by Father Farragher for the Aran Islanders. I learned it not from himself, but from another source, and I was left under the impression that he is at the beginning and end of every project undertaken in their behalf. I met him but once, some years ago, and that only for a short conversation; but the impression he left on me as a man of keen observation, of wide interests, and altogether an attractive personality, turned all my sympathy to him in a passing misunderstanding

which arose between him and some of the leaders of the Irish Language movement a few years ago. It is easy for those engrossed in one special interest to expect a man engrossed in many vital interests to carry out others' notions in others' ways; but for the man himself it is quite another thing. He works in the midst of circumstances, the influence of which on his daily activity no outsider can thoroughly measure or weigh. But I presume that a man who does many things well will do everything as well as he can; I conclude that a man of approved zeal who knows his business best does it best; that at least he does it better than any outsider can teach him.

Only within the past few days, and quite by accident, I learned of the Youghal Art Metal and Repoussé Work. It is one of the lessons which Father Aherne, C.C., took away from the Cork Exhibition of 1902. He asked the Co. Cork Technical Instruction Committee to pay a teacher for him. That Committee was satisfied with the project, but the Department refused to sanction the arrangement beyond half the teacher's salary. Father Aherne took what he got, made himself responsible for the rest, procured a competent teacher and opened the School in April, 1904. He carries on the School in the premises of the League of the Cross, and his purpose in starting it was to teach the members, or others willing to learn, an interesting and profitable occupation to which they might devote their leisure hours, or to which they might turn when no more remunerative work was to be had. It struck him from his observations at the Cork Exhibition that he could turn the craft to some purpose for the young men of Youghal, seeing that it is simple and at the same time interesting and artistic. He started the little venture on a capital of £17 17s. 7d., which was the reduction made by the Great Southern and Western Railway for the special trains run in connection with the Gaelic League *Feiseana* of 1903. It was a small sum to

begin with, but it enabled him to pay half the teacher's salary, to distribute amongst the pupils about £50, to spend £30 in fitting up the workshop, about £30 in incidental expenses, and he has as much remaining over after all as would repay the Gaelic League what they gave him. There are at present fourteen pupils attending the School, most of whom are engaged at other occupations during the day, and although they have been at the School for two hours every evening for some months only, they can add a few shillings a week to their regular wage, and by a craft that both recreates and educates them. Whoever would like to see some specimens of their work can find them in the magnificent mirrors which are to be seen at the Abbey Theatre in Dublin.

Several years before the coming of the Department, Father Hurley, parish priest of Inchigeela, Co. Cork, had instructions on Dairy work given in his parish, in connection with the Munster Dairy School. For more than fifteen years he has lace, crochet, and knitting industries in two or three centres in his parish. At Ballingeary, near Gougane Barra, he turned a disused schoolroom beside the village into an Industrial School, where, with the help of the Congested Districts Board, he had the unemployed girls of the village and neighbourhood taught Carrickmacross Lace and Limerick Crochet. Over forty girls are thus employed, and earn each from 8s. to 10s. a week. Besides these, he has established cookery, laundry, and manual instruction classes.

About three years ago Father Cregan, of Limerick, established St. Ita's House for the instruction and recreation of the members of his Women's Total Abstinence Sodality. Irish, reading, writing, arithmetic, music, and dressmaking are taught in it under the supervision of ladies who talk little about altruism, but practise much of it. About a year ago he started a shirt-factory in connection with the establishment, and at present has

up to thirty girls employed. The work is steadily extending, and promises to grow into a large industry in the near future. He has been enabled to take and fit up a large house for the work through the help of private friends. He applied to the Department for help, and was refused.

I might also review the industrial work done by Father Hegarty, of Eris; by Canon McGeany, of Crossmaglen; by Father M'Cleary, Father Marron, also in the North; by Father Glendon, O.P., in Dublin, and by Father Creagh, C.SS.R., in Limerick; and by many other priests of whose works I have heard—and there are a great many such works going on unknown to the public at large. I know of hardly any industrial work carried on through the country for the benefit of the people in general in which priests do not take an active and usually a leading part in initiating and promoting. Only last evening I learned from a casual remark made in the course of conversation that Father O'Donnell, the parish priest of Rathkeale, started a poultry and egg trade on the co-operative system about a twelve-month ago. He is one of the most intimate friends I have, and he lives about a dozen miles from where I write; yet it was quite unknown to me that the poultry breed in his parish and district has been gradually improved under his directions, and that the egg trade which he started less than a twelve-month ago has so far succeeded that it has had a turn over of over £2,000 within that short time. I daresay that there are very many similar cases through the country.

I give this as a last instance. Creevelea is a district retired amidst the mountains of Leitrim. It is several miles from a railway-station. During the past fifteen years it has lost a fifth of its inhabitants by emigration, and those who remain have to struggle for a bare living against the most adverse circumstances. For a

priest living in such a place it is provoking to hear the criticisms of those who spin out industrial possibilities which he is expected to translate into facts. In the midst of those surroundings did Father Meehan find himself cast some years ago for the first time. He spent a holiday one year at the Glasgow Exhibition, and another year at the Cork Exhibition, to find out some new industry suitable to the circumstances of his people; but he came to the conclusion that he would have to content himself with poultry, bees, gardening, and such industries as he had already introduced. Even these he had first to learn, and then to teach to the people; and he has acquired such proficiency that he is accepted as an expert on poultry in *The Country-Side*, a journal on that subject recently published in London, and he is a frequent contributor to the *Bee-Keeper*. It was not an easy change from science and modern languages which he had been teaching with much success for some years before, to the study of poultry, bees, and the growing of apples and pears. But he suffered the change for the sake of his people; and under his guidance they won, a few years ago, the First Prize for "The Brightening of Rural life," and First Prize for "Improving the Homes of the People." At his own expense he held a stall at the Cork Exhibition. He introduced a Cattle and General Agricultural Show to Creevelea, for which he has never asked a subscription, and yet it not only pays, but it is spoken of as a success by all classes. I have seen the catalogues of it for 1902 and 1903, and their varied character makes one wonder at the business ability and enterprise which could secure so much success in such a place. He has also a Hall for concerts and plays, which are given by the young people of the place whom he has trained. Besides these and other local works, such as Temperance and Libraries, he takes a leading part in several

public organizations, and is principal promoter of a railway scheme which, when completed, will open up several congested districts, and will help to realise a project of coal and iron mining which he desires to promote.

CHAPTER XII.

THE "CIVIC VIRTUES" OF THE NORTH CONSIDERED.

From the historical review I have made one will have observed that the Irish people have proved their industrial character by their industrial success at every time they have had an opportunity. We have seen it, first in the woollen, then in the linen, then in other manufactures, then in the cattle trade, then in agriculture; and, when all these had been destroyed by restrictive legislation, the Catholics of Ireland became successful merchants, shopkeepers, and tradesmen in spite of their drawbacks and disabilities, and had saved money by their thrift, whilst those who had supplanted them in every civil right and advantage had sunk in debt through extravagance. Then came the time when events enabled them to work out their national salvation through a free trade and a free parliament, and the industrial progress they made from 1782 to 1800 was phenomenal. Then clouds passed one after another over that dawn, blasted their hopes once more, and left them in industrial life a nation of enervated serfs down almost to the present day. For the fairness of that conclusion I appeal to the evidence I have given. And no sooner does a ground of hope appear in the shape of fixity of tenure, dual ownership, or the power of purchase, than the latent energy asserts itself again. About ten years ago the co-operative movement was inaugurated to meet foreign competition, and the following table, showing the membership of the various societies for rural interests during the past few years, reveals a

wonderful elasticity of mind considering the prostration of the past:—

	1899. No. of Members.	1900. No. of Members.	1901. No. of Members.
Leinster ...	4,605	5,924	6,600
Munster ...	7,366	8,023	10,289
Ulster ...	10,911	13,137	18,750
Connaught ...	16,970	19,122	21,572

At the end of 1902 the total number of members was 71,296, and at present it must be over 100,000.

It will be noticed that the membership in Munster and Leinster falls far short of that in Ulster. But that does not prove that any special civic virtues are to be found in the North. Lord Monteagle, the President of the Organization Society, explained the cause of the difference in a speech he delivered at the Fifth General Conference of the Societies in 1901. To which I add the observation that the membership in Connaught is far in advance of that in Ulster; and does that prove the existence of special "strenuous qualities" in the Catholics of Connaught? Moreover, in Ulster and Connaught the farms are usually very small, and the output of a dairy society in those provinces might not be more than that of a similar society in Munster with a membership several times less. In fact, Munster was the pioneer in the movement; and Ulster came last, waiting to learn wisdom from the enterprise of the South. Is it not a fact that Sir Horace had in vain tried to establish a society in the North until the strenuous Northerners had learned the likelihood of success from the enterprise of the South? Besides those societies which belong to the Irish Agricultural Organization, there are many industries in the country chiefly due to the action of nuns and priests, some of which had been in existence before it, and some of which have grown up since then.

Sir Horace writes*:—"The Protestant Communities of the North have developed the essentially strenuous qualities which, no doubt, they brought from England and Scotland. In city life their thrift, industry, and enterprise, unsurpassed in the United Kingdom, have built up a world-wide commerce. In rural life they have drawn the largest yield from relatively infertile soil. Such, in brief, is the achievement of Ulster Protestantism in the realm of industry."

And again†:—"I find that while the Protestants have given, and continue to give, a fine example of thrift and industry to the rest of the nation, the attitude of a section of them towards the majority of their fellow-countrymen has been a bigoted and unintelligent one. On the other hand, the Roman Catholic people of Ireland, while more free from bigotry, are apathetic, thriftless, and almost non-industrial, and that they especially require the exercise of strengthening influences on their moral fibre. . . . North and South have each virtues which the other lacks; each has much to learn from the other; but the home of the strictly civic virtues and efficiencies is to be found in the North."

The reader will be able to adjudge the value of those expressions from the short review which I proceed to make. Belfast had its beginning three centuries ago in the huts made for the soldiers of Essex around the Castle of the O'Neills. Its first inhabitants were the soldiers and the retainers attached to that Castle. It began, grew, and got its Charter and its privileges as an English city. After the flight of the Earls, 4,000,000 acres in Ulster were confiscated, and given to London companies, to Protestant bishops and incumbents, to corporations, forts, free schools; and Trinity College came in for its share.

*Page 98.

†At page 120.

The purpose of the previous confiscations was the establishment of the English power in Ireland; but in this confiscation there was a fresh purpose, namely, the establishment of Protestantism in Ireland. In 1652, after the Cromwellian wars, all Ireland was practically confiscated by Act of Parliament. In the system of plantation which followed these confiscations, one of the conditions under which the lands were distributed was that the undertakers should colonise their lands with English Protestants, and clear out the Irish who had lived in them. There were a great many English settlers in Ulster after it was first "planted"; but they gradually gave place to the Scottish Celt; the Irish who were suffered to remain had become labourers on the properties which they had once owned. I would here remind the reader of two important facts: one is that there is no province in Ireland so Celtic or less English than Ulster, except perhaps Connaught; the second is that very nearly half the population of Ulster is Catholic. In Donegal, Tyrone, Monaghan, Fermanagh, and Cavan, the Catholics are in a majority. In Armagh and Derry, they are almost as numerous as the Protestants. And if, in Down and Antrim, they form only about a fourth of the population it is owing to the presence of Belfast which extends into those two counties. Sir Horace, then, forgets his history and his facts when he writes of strenuous qualities and civic virtues, brought over from England, and flourishing in Protestant Ulster; as if the English race were a strong element there, or as if the Catholics did not form half the population.

What is known as the Ulster tenant-right is supposed to have begun when that province was "planted" in the time of James I., and after the flight of the Earls. That right was not founded on law, but on custom.

Any landlord who chose might disregard it, and the tenant had no legal security against eviction, no legal claim to the benefit of his improvements, no legal right to sell his good-will to another. The custom probably arose as an inducement and a privilege to the "planters" who were brought over from England and Scotland, and it has been usually respected, at least in favour of Protestant tenants, down to our day. I mean, of course, down to the year 1870, when Gladstone's first Land Act decreed that the usages prevalent in Ulster should thenceforth be legal. The Ulster custom can even still be used to advantage. The Act of 1881 which gave the right of free sale to the tenant, gave the right of pre-emption to the landlord. Hence the latter can claim the right to buy; and according to the Act of 1881, the price is to be fixed by the Court, which will fix not what open competition may bring, but what may be considered a fair price. There is no escape from that outside Ulster. But in Ulster a tenant has the option of selling either under the new Act or under the old custom; and he will naturally choose the latter, since the landlord has no right of pre-emption, and the sale is made by open competition between all who wish to buy. What the industrial result of that security has been, I let Butt explain:—

"Evidence clear, distinct, and overwhelming, abundantly proves that to the custom of tenant-right Ulster owes its prosperity, the character of the population, and above all its freedom from agrarian crime. . . . In these districts where the Ulster custom prevails we meet with a manliness, a boldness, and a sturdy independence of character, which we seek in vain in the naturally finer population of the South. The northern yeoman, for such is almost his position, can call his farm his own, his farmhouse his castle, and the fruits of his industry he can claim for himself. He does not

live in constant expectation of the visit of the bailiff with his notice to quit, or fear to show any sign of superior comfort, lest it may be an invitation to the agent to raise the rent. He has all the conscious dignity which belongs to the sense of proprietorship in the soil. To this, and not to difference of race or religion, must we attribute the independent spirit which is the characteristic of the farming population of the North. It is from men trained from childhood in this sense of independence, that we would expect the habits of energy and enterprise, and self-reliance, which alone can make a people prosperous and great. Exactly in the very districts in which tenant-right has impressed independence on the people, we find all these qualities exerted, with a result of manufacturing progress and prosperity as great as has been achieved by any English community. The marvellous advance of Belfast is the best testimony to the value of fixity of tenure. In natural qualities—in intellectual and physical power, the race that have created it are certainly not superior to the races that inhabit the plains of Munster. In climate, in soil, in all natural advantages of position, Belfast is far behind Limerick and Cork. We are told that religious dissensions are the ruin of Irish prosperity. Limerick and Cork are free from them. In Belfast, the town has been held for days by partisan mobs engaged in deadly conflict with each other in the streets. We are reminded of the history of the Italian Republics, some of whom made the most rapid progress in material wealth while they were torn and distracted by the furies of civil strife. Shall I be met by the bigot cant that it is Protestantism that gives Belfast its superiority? Roman Catholics, and Celtic Roman Catholics, are among the most energetic and enterprising of those who have been the architects of their own fortunes in the metropolis of the North. We are com-

pelled to find the cause of its unparalleled prosperity in the fact, that it stands in the centre of a district in which tenant-right has trained the people to habits of independence and industry, and has taught them those lessons of self-reliance, from which spring the powers of energy and enterprise—the great, the only elements of national success."*

Besides, the spirit which "planted" Ulster, and the purpose of Protestantizing the province which gave rise to the tenant-right custom in favour of the Protestant colonists had a natural tendency to deal otherwise with the Catholics; and these have been rack-rented and evicted in Ulster as elsewhere, although not perhaps to the same extent. In 1830 was formed the *Protestant Colonization Society of Ireland*, when emigration was threatening the Protestant Ascendancy in the North. Its name tells its object; and the means by which it proposed to attain that object was to secure waste lands, or lands which had become "unoccupied from other causes," and to plant therein "eligible farmers and artisans, with Scriptural education for the benefit of settlers, and the ordinances of pure and undefiled religion for the people at large." The following were amongst its rules:—

4th. Every tenant distinctly understands and agrees, that no Roman Catholic, under any pretence whatever, shall be allowed to reside or be employed in any Colony of the Society.

5th. Every colonist who shall marry a Roman Catholic shall, after due notice, retire from the colony, he being permitted to dispose of or carry away his private property.

The Society, which included landed proprietors, parsons, military men, Fellows of Trinity College, etc., began their work with about 1,000 acres of land on the property of Sir Edmund Hayes, Bart., in Co. Donegal. In a statement read at a meeting of the Society, held in Dublin, on May 24th, 1832, Mr. Ruxton Pooler, the

* *A Plea for the Celtic Race*, pages 48, 49, 50.

Local Superintendent of the Colony, fittingly illustrates how the happy brotherhood were putting out their strenuous energies in that Eden of the North:—"We are at present in full employment, burning the ground laid out by the deputation—men and boys, horses and asses." But the Babel came after the Noah's Ark. This was the result, described by a resident in the neighbourhood in 1889.

"About the time referred to, the late Sir Edmund Hayes built on a large tract of mountain land six or seven slated houses, and brought Scotch settlers to occupy them. I could not find out on what terms. But there is not a remnant of the original settlers in the place for many years. They remained for some time, until they spent any means they had, and went away paupers. He intended to build more houses, and hoped to be able to proselytise all the Papists in the neighbourhood. He laid out the foundations of a Protestant church, and got large quantities of stones for the building, when the bubble burst. Nothing has been attempted since, and the houses are now in a tumble-down condition."

The project died, but not the spirit that created it. At a meeting of the Protestant Conservative Society, which was held in Dublin in 1834, a well-known parson, Rev. Charles Boyton, told them that, in seeking the cause of their insecurity, they should not look to Popery, disaffection, or democracy, that they "must go deeper, and seek it in the destitution and agony of the population"; to which expression of truth and common sense, Rev. Marcus Beresford, afterwards Protestant Archbishop of Armagh, amidst the cheers of the audience, replied by exhorting his brethren to drive the Popish rebels from their glebe lands and plant good godly Protestants in their place. Evidently, in the frenzy of his oratory he forgot to consider the tithes, and who would pay them when the Papists were gone.

In 1841, a fresh start was made by the *Protestant Tenantry Society*. Its Prospectus deplores that "where the Established Church once stood, and the pure religion of Christ was disseminated, now stands the Popish Mass-house, pouring forth the soul-destroying doctrines and immorality of Maynooth," and it proclaims the duty, for the sake of religion and civilisation, of preventing the disappearance of the "present Protestant tenantry of Ireland to make way for the Papist who introduces the misery, the superstition, and conspiracy, of which his religious and political creeds are so prolific." And it says that "the Irish Protestant Tenantry Society will strenuously labour to meet and counteract this destructive course of things. It will exert itself by every lawful means within its reach to retain the Protestant population, and to introduce a Protestant peasantry into the districts before alluded to."*

I have quoted those passages for the admission they contain, rather than for the purpose they set forth. The Prospectus implies that the pious Protestant peasantry of the North—the men of energy and success, were gradually disappearing before an immoral Popish peasantry —the men of misery and failure. It is unnecessary to tell the story of a project set on foot by men who produced a prospectus like that—it flickered for a while and died. What is more, one of its patrons, the Earl of Dunraven, became a Catholic, and the family of another, Lord Lorton, is, I believe, known no longer in the North where it was then a power. All this tells of the privileges which Protestantism enjoyed in Ulster; and of course those in authority favoured it with every lucrative or influential office and appointment in their power. But, putting all special patronage aside, the agricultural population of Ulster, Protestant or Papist, must needs

*Quoted in *Essays on Ireland*, by O'Neill Daunt, page 298.

be more industrious than the more pastoral population of Munster:—the land is poorer, and demands more diligent labour. In the South, or even in the same Munster county, let us say of Limerick or Tipperary, those who live in mountainous or poor land are, as a matter of fact and as a matter of necessity, more industrious than those who dwell in the fertile districts of the plain where they can leisurely look on as the grass grows and the cattle fatten.

A few years ago I heard a well-known priest, given to making economics without facts, say, that "what we want in Ireland is, to have a number of Scotch farmers brought over and placed here and there through the country, as models from whom Irish farmers could learn how to farm their lands with profit." "Yes," replied a distinguished Ecclesiastic who was present, and who thought that facts should govern economics, "I remember a number of them who did come over. They held fine farms, farmed them after your more perfect way, and got 'broken.' There is not one of them left. Every Irish farmer knows, from his experience and from the tradition of his father before him, what every field of his farm can do. His difficulty is, not want of knowledge—which of course may be improved—but want of capital, and want of security."

Stanley wrote in 1833 of the state of things amongst the cottiers of the North:—"People cannot think of cleanliness and order, who for the most part have not habitations fit for human beings, or sufficient food. Some reviewers of Ireland have supposed that the Roman Catholic religion is the cause of these habits; as in the North, the working classes professing other religions are in a more comfortable condition. The difference there has no doubt arisen from the religious influences which obtained advantages for the few not extended to the many. Almost all the cottiers in the

North professing the reformed religions, got with their cottages a small quantity of ground, and were weavers. While the cottiers professing the Catholic religion were for the most part field labourers. This made all the difference in their condition.'*

Let us now turn from agriculture to manufactures. I have already related that Crommelin, one of the linen manufacturers who were brought over to Ulster from France in 1700, agreed to promote his industry in the South, if his patent were extended; but Government refused the condition. An Act of Parliament made in 1706, speaks as follows:—"Forasmuch as the Protestant interest in Her Majesty's kingdom of Ireland ought to be supported by giving the utmost encouragement to the linen manufactures of that kingdom, Her Majesty is graciously pleased in tender regard to her good Protestant subjects of her said kingdom, and for the further encouragement of the linen manufactures thereof, to allow Irish manufactured linen to be shipped to the English colonies." In 1742, Parliament granted a bounty on British and Irish linens. That is how Belfast was made, how "the strenuous qualities" of Protestantism were brought out, and how "the civic virtues and efficiencies" came to be found in the North. The economic changes of the past half century have depressed agricultural industry, have destroyed those home industries which in the past generation prevailed over Ireland, and have turned the people towards those industrial centres which, when machinery came into play, had already grown strong enough to take advantage of it. Hence the rapid growth of Belfast during the nineteenth century; and the introduction of ship-building has helped to expand it more. Now, let me introduce the following facts as jewels into the setting I have just made. They

**Commentaries on Ireland* The Cloncurry Prize Essay, page 313.

are twelve years old, but that does not lessen their value as evidence:—Of 29,798 males employed in the linen factories of Belfast, only 8,120 are Catholics; of 57,262 females, 20,773 are Catholics. The number of persons employed in the ship-building industry is 3,331, of whom only 443 are Catholics. The Local Government of Ulster has in its service 1,192 male and 230 female officials; and of these only 199 males and 56 females are Catholics. But, in spite of evictions and Protestant Colonisation Schemes, old and new, out of 154,876 farmers in Ulster, 87,453, or over 56 per cent. are Catholics. There are in all 314,372 persons engaged in agricultural industry in Ulster, and of these 179,684, or 57 per cent. are Catholics.

But, setting all consideration of these Catholic disabilities aside, and looking at actual facts as to thrift, prosperity, industry, culture, and the other civic virtues which, we are told by Sir Horace, find their home in the North, let us see how matters stand. Taking the Income-tax paid as a basis of comparison, the following table made from the Income-tax assessment used by the Home Office, and presented to Parliament in 1882, shows:—

Leinster pays per head of the population ...		£10	6	9
Munster	Do. ...	£6	0	7
Ulster	Do. ...	£5	14	5
Connaught	Do. ...	£3	13	7

That comparison shows how things were before the rest of Ireland began to benefit by tenant-right which the Protestants of Ulster had been enjoying for three centuries. Comparing Dublin and Belfast, the former was charged £102,609, and the latter only £40,736 Income-tax. Comparing Londonderry and Waterford, which have about an equal population, the former was assessed at £3,981, and the latter at £6,253.

The following Table shows the Income-tax on profits made in professions and trades:—

Leinster	...	...	£4	2	6*
Ulster	...	...	£1	9	1
Munster	...	...	£1	7	4
Connaught	...	...	£0	6	1

Again, at a conference of flax-growers and flax-spinners held in Belfast on June 7th, 1900, Mr. R. H. Reade, D.L., who presided, said in the course of his speech, that "the growth of flax will be an extinct branch of agriculture in this country unless means are taken to arrest its downward progress," and he recommended the Belgian methods of flax culture, in order to improve the quality to the proper degree of fineness. And Mr. Anderson, Secretary of the I.A.O.S., said:—"There is no need for me to point out that the flax industry is declining; one has only to take the statistics showing that the area under flax has diminished from 200,000 acres to 34,000 or 35,000 acres." The growers, the scutchers, and the spinners assign different causes for the decline of the industry, and in general they blame one another. But the fact, at any rate, is, that the spinners of Belfast spend £3,000,000 a year in the purchase of foreign flax. Mr. Anderson agrees with Mr. Reade that the strenuous industrialists of Ulster would do wisely to go and learn flax culture from the industrialists of Catholic Belgium.

The Protestants of Ireland are at present paying the natural penalty of past monopoly, in their want of industrial efficiency. Competition is the life of trade, and they had no competitor in Ireland. But, as competition comes on them from at home or from abroad, it finds them lying fallow. Towards their Catholic fellow-countrymen they are trying to live on their reputation

*Statistics taken from *A Word for Ireland*, by T. M. Healy, M.P., pages 155, *et seq.*

for business ability, as their colleges used to live on their educational prestige till the Catholic colleges got an opportunity of measuring merits with them, and made the bubble burst. Their industrialism was a growth forced by favouritism; and their reputation had not an absolute value, but only shone out on the industrial apathy of the Catholics, who for generations put out little energy because they were left little hope. Let us take two illustrations which have come before the public during these days. The Provincial Bank is almost exclusively managed by Protestants, and all its Directors except one are English or Scotch; yet during the past half-year, its profits have fallen by £8,000, and its deposits by £92,000, whilst the business of the Munster and Leinster Bank, which is managed mostly by Catholics, has improved. The Midland Railway which is managed in the same manner, shows similar signs of mismanagement. On the other hand, the County Councils have gained much praise from many and high quarters for the administrative and constructive ability they have shown. I have seen it stated somewhere that Lord Dunraven has given the Limerick County Council credit for a keener and clearer insight into their work than the London County Council. The Great Southern and Western Railway is also notoriously managed by Protestants, and yet the value of its stock has fallen to an alarming degree. But how have they dealt with the difficulties and criticisms which aggrieved shareholders set before them at their recent meeting? They parry them with "We have come here to do business; we are men of business and we cannot waste time over those trifles." They parry appeals for proportionate Catholic representation on the Directorate with—"This is a non-sectarian meeting; we cannot allow religious matters to be discussed." That is, their spirit of sectarianism having manned the directorate with their own,

they call it sectarianism for Catholics to complain. For them, non-sectarianism means monopoly, and to attack their monopoly is to intrude sectarianism.

I have now said all that I have thought necessary to say on the present state of material progress in Ulster and its metropolis. One word on the evidences of human progress to be found there. As to religion; a friend of mine tells me that, during a recent visit to a town in Antrim, he was struck by the contrast between the well-dressed sameness of the Protestant worshippers and the Catholic variety of the Papists, as he saw each congregation leave their respective churches on Sunday. He saw in it an illustration of the thrift of the one, and the thriftlessness of the other, until he was informed that the Protestants feel that their presence in church is not desirable unless they can afford to appear in proper Sunday elegance; and those who cannot dress well do not go. As a body, they bottle up their devotion through the year, in reserve for the religious practices of the 12th July, when their piety pours forth like a volcano, polluting everything with a mixture of intoxication, blasphemy, bolts, and blood. But, then, they have the "civic virtues and efficiencies," and we are asked to take that as the test of civilisation, since it is the religious ideal of naturalism. Of literary life, there is a painful absence in wealthy Belfast; it has not produced even a respectable newspaper or magazine. Of art, they seem to have little conception. The practical life they live unfits them for the ideal. I suppose it is a sign of the "economic sense"; for Sir Horace Plunkett thinks we should put away the thought of art in our churches, and wait for "the native artistic sense and industrial spirit now beginning to seek creative expresssion." But if Belfast means to wait for its art till a Giotto or a Fra Angelico has arisen, it will have to wait a long time. No national art has ever grown in that way. The artistic genius is created, or rather

discovered, in the process of growth. If the people of Perugia were like the people of Belfast, Perugino would probably have gone to his grave unhonoured and unknown. And the "industrial spirit seeking creative expression" has simply no meaning in æsthetics. The highest point in the way of art which the industrial spirit could reach is a photograph; but that is not art, unless we impart elasticity to the word. Sir Horace's æsthetic philosophy reminds me of a paper I heard read on this subject a few years ago by one of his disciples; he impressed me on that occasion as one who had studied art in guide books, but never saw the master-pieces to which he alluded, and I have since learned that he had never been outside Ireland.

> Rusticus expectat dum defluat amnis, at ille
> Labitur et labetur in omne volubilis ævum.

That is the principle on which we are asked to have Ecclesiastical Art developed in Ireland. On the same principle, I suppose, the people of Belfast have waited till they are wealthy, to build a cathedral. Verily, "the children of this world are wiser in their generation" than the Catholics of Cloyne and Cashel, of Limerick and Armagh, who have anticipated their wealth, and the "ready cash" which their cathedrals have cost. One thing is certain—Belfast is not the Athens of Ireland.

CHAPTER XIII.

CATHOLIC *v.* NON-CATHOLIC SUPERSTITION.

We have not yet sounded the depths of priestly responsibility in Ireland. "But after all," Sir Horace writes, "these criticisms are, for the purposes of my argument, of minor relevance and importance. The real matter in which the direct and personal responsibility of the Roman Catholic clergy seems to me to be involved is the character and *morale* of the people of this country." And he proceeds to say that after making full allowance for historical influence, "I still think that with their unquestioned authority in religion, and their almost equally undisputed influence in education, the Roman Catholic clergy cannot be exonerated from some responsibility in regard to Irish character as we find it to-day. Are they, I would ask, satisfied with that character? I cannot think so." Neither do I think so. But let us consider how he discerns the want of character and *morale* in Irish Catholics. Later on I will examine how far the influence of the priests in education has been undisputed. Meanwhile, let us consider the following:—"The impartial observer will, I fear, find amongst a majority of our people a listlessness and apathy in regard to economic improvement which amount to a form of fatalism; and, in backward districts, a survival of superstition, which saps all strength of will and purpose." *

From his point of view, not only Irish Catholics in backward districts, but every Catholic everywhere is superstitious in many things.

* Page 110.

He, of course, thinks that our belief, for instance, in the Real Presence is a superstition; even the king, on assuming the sceptre to rule us, had to call on God to witness that he believes it of us. And there is no doubt that the Blessed Eucharist is the object of either the sublimest act of human worship or of the most abject superstition known to civilisation. Sir Horace will reply that he does not think us superstitious in that belief; to which I rejoin that he must think us so, under pain of inconsistency. As I, or any other Catholic, kneel down to receive the Blessed Eucharist we adore as God what is in appearance only bread. Sir Horace, I am quite sure, respects the sincerity of our belief. But that is not the question. Our sincerity will excuse us, but it will not do away with the superstition. If it were otherwise, those superstitions which he tells us play such moral havoc in backward districts, would likewise cease to be superstitions; because those poor folk to whom he alludes are no doubt quite sincere as to the righteousness of their beliefs or customs. He does not specify what those "survivals of superstition" are, and he therefore precludes me from discussing them on their merits. Does he allude to the notorious Tipperary witch case? Prescinding from the question whether the chief actor in that tragedy was a lunatic, or not—and religious maniacs are to be found everywhere, that his was a singular case appears from the fact, carefully concealed by our traducers, that he was hooted by his neighbours whose moral instincts were shocked by his action.

We are supposed to be always on the defence, making apologies for our beliefs or customs; even held responsible for the conduct of fanatics or fools. But the home of the "simpler Christianity" across the Channel has been the home of superstition and fanaticism from the days of the Lancashire witches and Johanna Southcote down to the faith-healers, the spirit-rappers, the crystal gazers,

the traders in borderland yarn, the Elijahs and all the other-world messengers of to-day.* I have before me

* A fortune-teller was lionised last year by crowds of visitors to Blackpool. *The Times,* of Aug. 18th, 1904 reports a witch case, which was tried at the Marlborough Street Police Court. Two similar cases were tried the week before. On Oct. 6th, at the Clerkenwell Sessions, the case of Charles and Martha Stephenson, professionally known as the "Keiros," was tried. Their clients were not Popish peasants living "in backward districts" in Ireland, but "simpler Christians" living in English cities. According to the lawyer who defended them, they had "some of the most distinguished people" amongst their clients. One lady, who wanted to know if a certain gentleman would marry her, wrote—"Enclosed is order for £2 for the crystal, but I have not seen anything in it yet." Another who had been warned by the crystal-gazers against riding in December wanted to know if the warning included driving also, as she did not ride. A gentleman who was anxious about some examination that was to come off, wanted to help him over it successfully.

A child seventeen months old died at Scarborough recently. There was an inquest; and the mother, in answer to the Coroner, gave evidence that the child was bewitched, that, she knew the woman who did it, because the said woman threatened "to bewitch the child by boiling eggs and mashing them."

In May, 1903, *Truth* states: "The latest case is reported from Exeter, where a 'witch doctor,' named Thomas, was convicted of having defrauded a number of country people. Thomas had a great reputation in his occult profession, and the practice he carried on is said to have been worth £300 a year. Fatheads, who imagined they had been 'overlooked' or bewitched, were constantly paying him handsome fees to exorcise the malign spirit or influence. In a typical case a farmer who had had the misfortune to lose some of his stock parted with £22 for a 'cure' in the form of a powder, which Thomas instructed him to throw about the homestead, between 9 p.m. and midnight while he said the Lord's Prayer."

Such a man even as Harold Frederic died a martyr to that craze called "Christian Science." I take the following from *The Daily News,* of Sept. 29th, 1904:—"In so far as the tragedy of Mr. Harold Frederic should have proved a warning against 'Christian Science healers,' the sacrifice of that brilliant writer was, apparently, in vain. There are circumstances surrounding the death of Mr. Colin Hunter, A.R.A., the famous artist, which recall that pathetic case to mind. . . . . For close upon three years Mr. Hunter had suffered from grave internal maladies, as well as brain trouble, and throughout that long time, while he was slowly and surely dying, he was in the hands of 'Christian Science healers,' who were absolutely ignorant of all medical science. He was not himself a 'Christian Scientist.' Mr. Colin Hunter had now and again, in its early days, attended that 'First Church of Christian Scientists.' which has now disappeared from Bryanston Street, Edgeware Road. But he never believed in their tenets. Unhappily, Mrs. Colin

a list of society palmists, Christian scientists, crystal gazers, clairvoyants, psychometrists, psychic developers, and other borderland interpreters, open to receive clients or to attend "at homes;" from which it appears that they are doing a profitable trade.

About a generation ago the name of Biddy Early had spread far and wide from the hills of Clare where she resided. Now, Biddy was of the same trade as those to whom I have just referred. There was only this difference:—Biddy was not known to the unscientific folk around her as a crystal gazer or a "scientist," but as a "knowledgeable woman"; and whereas her English

Hunter and her two charming daughters became victims to the alluring nonsense preached by Mrs. Eddy and the followers of that American bare-faced female apostle who founded her present gigantic fortune when, without scruple, she put herself forward as the re-incarnation of the Divinity, and pretended to bestow the gift of miracles and healing upon those who became her disciples. They followed the Church from Bryanston Street to its present shelter in Wilbraham Place, Sloane Square, and were prominent and highly esteemed members of the aristocratic but deluded community of 'Christian Scientists.' When Mr. Hunter fell ill, so great was the faith of his poor wife in the powers of these people that she at once sent for a 'healer.' Six or seven were tried in succession. Then there came to this country from India a new miracle-worker, Charles A. Wase, a young man of thirty years. Mr. Wase rapidly acquired the position of 'principal healer' among the 'Christian Scientists.' . . . So great became the demand for his services that he had to connect his rooms with the telephone. He was sent for by the family to attend Mr. Colin Hunter, and for nearly two years he has been in attendance on the unhappy and dying artist." This is Mr. Wase's account of his philosophy to a representative of the *Daily News*:—"I am simply a mental healer, a Christian Science healer. We do not work by hypnotism, but by realising man's connection with his cause, that in his greater self he is part of his cause, and that, while we recognise physical ailments, there can be no illness in the man's greater self, and that therefore physical ailments must disappear the moment the greater self is realised." Is there a peasant in Ireland who could be fascinated by blasphemous "blarney" like that? St. Paul wrote to the Thessalonians of "him whose coming is according to the work of Satan, in all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and in all seduction of iniquity to them that perish; because they received not the love of truth that they might be saved. Therefore God shall send them the operation of error, to believe lying." (2 Thess. chap. ii., 9, 10).

sister divinities charge fashionable fees, Biddy was satisfied if her clients brought her a bottle of whiskey. Would Sir Horace point out the difference between the *pishogue*-makers and the fashionable fortune-tellers who are called palmists? I will tell him; the latter make more dupes and more money than the former, and the former are all but extinct in Ireland, whilst the latter are living and thriving in London and in other centres of material progress and of the industrial spirit. Superstitions are to be found in forward as well as in "backward districts" of Ireland, England, America, and everywhere. But, which bears the brand of degradation deeper—the superstition which refuses to use basic slag recommended by the Department, or the faith-cure which refuses medicine and keeps out the doctor? Sir Horace does not specify the superstitions to which he alludes; but, after a fair experience both of England and of the Continent I am bound to say that Catholic Ireland is by comparison very free from those excrescences of the human fancy which are common to both scepticism and faith. Pascal used to say that the age of incredulity is the most credulous age. But those who affect scientific acquirements may with impunity nail a horse-shoe to their halldoor for luck, or a New York girl may sew a lock of her hair in her friend's wedding-gown as a charm to make her own turn come next; but an Irish Catholic peasant dare not turn home when he sees a lone magpie under pain of having himself and the Catholic faith which he professes set forth in terms of pity or contempt by writers who imagine they are philosophers. What are those superstitions to which he particularly alludes? Is it that Catholics "in backward districts" wear scapulars? Many eminent Catholics devoutly wear them. I may mention the late Lord Emly, for an instance, as the fact was published in the newspapers after his death. Is it that they use Holy

Water? Every Catholic does so. Is it that they "pay rounds" at holy wells? That is one way of reducing the Catholic doctrine of the Invocation of Saints to practice, and I think it is a very excellent way. The Duke of Norfolk used to take his late son to the Grotto of Lourdes and to St. Winifred's Well. To the mind of his Grace, it was an act of faith; according to the mind of certain philosophers it was an act of foolishness; to the feelings of elite souls it was an act of superstitious vulgarity, the stain of which could hardly be washed out by "all the blood of all the Howards." The late M. Pasteur used to practise similar "superstitions" when, for years before his death, he yearly visited Arbois to take part in their parish Feast with the inhabitants of his native village. We will find similar "superstitions" in Belgium and in the Rhenish Provinces of Germany, and yet they lead the way in phases of economic life where England lags behind. The fact is, Sir Horace is incapable of interpreting the thoughts of the Catholics in those "backward districts" to which he alludes. They may have some practices which a Catholic should condemn as superstitious. I cannot say, for he does not name any. Everyone who believes in Divine Providence and in the influence of the Supernatural in the world runs a risk of being at some time or other, in some practice or belief, superstitious. Because one who believes at all in supernatural agencies may be led, in one case or in another, to attribute to the supernatural an effect which might have come from natural causes. That is natural. Such accidents happen in every phase of human thought and conduct. The very human freedom which gives us power to do good leaves us also the power to do evil; the very power we have to find truth sometimes leads us also into error. To preclude the possibility of superstition we should disown the supernatural altogether. And even that would not prevent it, since, as we have

seen, those who do deny the supernatural are often superstitious, although in their case it implies inconsistency as well as error. But a Catholic who is superstitious, and he is so much less frequently than our critics think, is not inconsistent; he merely falls into an error of judgment. Superstition is an excrescence on supernatural faith in the person who believes; and it is morally certain to exist amongst a people who realise the unseen. But, for those who disown belief in any supernatural influence to act as if they did, is the mark of men whose minds are out of gear. Last year a very severe illness kept me for some time on the balance between death and life. I had the benefit of medical care and skill than which I would not seek in Dublin or London any on which I would place more trust. Yet I believe that my recovery was very much due to the prayers of the people. I suppose that some who read this confession will say: "The superstition only of an ignorant Catholic!"

Be it so; but having accepted Catholic principles, I shall not let myself be thought the coward to disown, nor the fool to refuse the consequences. I will insist in believing that "more things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of." Sir Horace, with the best intentions, cannot understand us; but he evidently thinks that he does. He has in several matters fallen into precisely the same mistake to which he, too charitably I fear, traces English misrule in this country: namely, he has "standardized" us.

It is so with Lecky also. He thus writes with off-hand contempt; "St. Januarius, it is true, continues to liquefy at Naples;"* and he says in general that, even amongst Catholics, no educated person would accept a miracle to-day on any evidence, and he adds, "they are repudiated, not because they are unsupported, but because

* *History of Rationalism in Europe*, Vol. I., page 143.

they are miracles." As to the particular instance he gives, I had the privilege of examining the phial containing the Saint's blood on one occasion when it was said to liquefy. I withhold the impression that was made on myself; I merely observe that Cardinal Newman thinks that there is evidence of the liquefaction quite enough to convince one. To dispose of the assumption that no educated person believes in modern miracles, it is enough to place Newman on one pan of the balance and Lecky on the other. These critics will not even consider the evidence for a modern miracle. An occurrence cannot be a miracle, they say, because miracles do not happen now. I wonder when had such men as Lecky a letter from heaven, announcing that from a certain date back in history the Hand of God was to be shortened, and that miracles were to be no more. A Catholic does not reason in that way. He weighs the evidence in each case and decides for himself, as every Catholic is free to do as to the alleged miracles at Naples or Lourdes. The Catholic founds his judgment on the evidence of fact; the rationalist draws his conclusion from a preconceived fancy—miracles do not happen. Thus they reason who deplore Catholic superstition.

There is far less superstition even amongst the Catholic illiterate folk in Ireland than outsiders think. But if I went in search of downright and unexceptionable superstition I would go to Protestantism of all shades, from Church of England orthodoxy to agnosticism. What is "Christian science" but a superstition? The notorious Dowie, whom a Catholic might in charity think a lunatic, was taken for Elijah on his own testimony in America, the Mecca of the industrial spirit. He had the "economic sense," and he traded successfully on their superstition till he rose—or fell?—from a pauper to a millionaire. And had he not let his prophetic *afflatus* mislead him to preach at the king when he came

to London, he would have filled every hall there with superstitious audiences, and his pockets with their cash. Superstition in a rationalist is much more degrading than superstition in a Popish peasant of a "backward district." There is reason at the root of the peasant's superstition—which is but an excrescence on the living tree of faith. The rationalist who is afraid, for instancee, to sit down to dinner, one of a party of thirteen, or who follows the "Christian science" craze, simply sets his principles and his practice by the ears. A rationalist, whose conduct in any way at all implies the reality of the supernatural, is a square circle; is a hollow sham who accepts sometimes what he affects to deplore in others at all times. In a Catholic superstition is accidental, the result of a personal error of judgment in a particular case; in a rationalist it is essentially a denial of his principles. Error is bad; inconsistency is worse; superior wisdom affected in inconsistency is contemptible. Standing on those premises, I declare this opinion, that the most illiterate Catholic old crone I have ever met, taken with some superstitions accidental to her faith, is higher in the scale of rational civilisation than some of those who abuse reason and try to sublimate the result of the act by calling it rationalism. Those always remind me of a sign-board bearing the inscription "Spirit store and tea emporium" which I once saw over the door of what was little better than a huxter's shop.

We hold ourselves open to the criticism of all; but let those who undertake the task do us the justice, or rather let them show their reason the respect of first taking the trouble to understand what they criticise in us. If a Catholic, borrowing their over-weening spirit for a moment, turns on them and treats them as ignorant, they resent it. When they refer to Catholics as ignorant, it is their natural privilege; if a

Catholic refers to them as ignorant, it is due to his want of culture. But we are thought fair game for all classes of critics, from the well-meaning man, such as Sir Horace is, down to those who malign us for money.

In a book just published in London, called *Father Clancy*, the author represents a Catholic girl as replying to a priest who asked her what she wore around her neck—"Oh! it's a scapular I have, yer Riv'rence; there is the Blessed Eucharist in it." The author must have got his knowledge of the scapular from some book on etymology; and the idea of having the Blessed Eucharist in a scapular is not only unreal but simply shocking. I have taken the trouble to get from an illiterate old woman living in one of the lanes near me her idea of the intelligence of this writer; and without wasting space on the circumstantial ornaments, I give the substance of the conversation:—

"I read in a book lately of a woman who kept the Blessed Eucharist in her scapular."

The old woman—"Yerra, Lor', Father, who said that? Sure, no wan ever heard of the Blessed Saycrament in a scaffler?"

"Well, it is in the book at any rate."

The old woman—"Yeh! your Reverence, he was a Prodishtant or somethin'. Whoever said that didn't know no betther. What would thim know about scafflers or the Blessed Saycrament—no more than Jack there," pointing to a dog lying comfortably in a snug corner near the fire. And after a few moments' pause, turning her eyes towards heaven, and gathering her beads between her thin veiny hands, she continued—"Sure, but for the goodness of God and His Blessed Mother, I might be as ignorant meself! God help us! an' 'tis thankful to God we ought to be. I was taking out me bades to say a few prayers when your Reverence came in. 'Tis nothin' else I am able to do now! Glory,

honour, and praise be to His Holy Name!" Anyone who understands Catholic teaching will discern behind those spontaneous utterances of that simple woman a clearer conception of the meaning of the Supernatural, of the impotence of the human intellect to grasp the mysteries of faith, or of the human will to do meritorious acts than is to be found in the brains of half the critics who would measure the Infinite, and are wise in their own conceit.

Those superstitions found by Sir Horace in "backward districts, sapping all strength of will and purpose," are as imaginary as the peasant who refused to spray his potatoes lest he might be guilty of denying the Providence of God. That ubiquitous peasant has been met by every itinerant economist in the country, from Clare to Donegal. But one understands such chestnuts, all plucked from the same tree. It is possible that some shrewd countryman made the excuse as a good-natured way of getting rid of an agent for spraying machines. The Irish peasant is very sceptical of every *deus ex machina* that comes to kill microbes and to revolutionise agriculture. Any neighbour who affects these novelties they call "The Scotchman," in memory of the Scotch farmers who came over here a few generations ago, worked their farms on improved methods, and went away paupers. Nevertheless, the Irish peasant is amongst the purest of empiric philosophers, inasmuch as he will spray his garden, without meaning any offence to Divine Providence, once he sees fair grounds for thinking that the process will prevent the potato blight.

I would remind Sir Horace that, not superstition, not fatalism, has "sapped all strength of will and purpose in the backward districts" and in the forward districts of this country, but the intolerance, the injustice, and the despotism of those for whom he makes himself the

well-meaning, but not very logical apologist. The fatalism which he has found amongst the people was caused by the insurmountable barrier which the law built up between them and all industrial improvement. Even a drowning man strikes out strongly as long as he has hope to reach the shore, but he sinks helplessly to the bottom when all hope is gone. Their fatalism arose not from the inexorable laws of nature, but from the inexorable laws of man. It is true they were under the power of three Fates. They had their Clotho Lachesis and Atropos, in misgovernment, in landlordism, and in Protestantism; their only ray of hope and spring of happiness came from that Catholic faith to which their critics trace all their woes.

CHAPTER XIV.

LOSS OF FAITH ABROAD; INTEMPERANCE AT HOME.

Sir Horace finds another proof of the want of character in Irish Catholics, which he thus expresses:—"Nor can the Roman Catholic Clergy altogether console themselves with the thought that religious faith, even when free from superstition, is strong in the breasts of the people. So long, no doubt, as Irish Roman Catholics remain at home, in a country of sharply defined religious classes, and with a social environment and a public opinion so preponderatingly stamped with their creed, open defections from Roman Catholicism are rare. But we have only to look at the extent of the 'leakage' from Roman Catholicism in the United States and in Great Britain, to realise how largely emotional and formal must be the religion of those who lapse so quickly in a non-Catholic atmosphere."

That is to say: even in our faith as distinct from our superstitions, we are wanting in character. Those who write about the "leakage" in England and elsewhere, remind one of the scientists who tell us the age of the earth. The widely discrepant information they give us only brings us deeper darkness instead of light. I have no personal knowledge of America, but I could quote American bishops and priests who have spent their lives there against the exaggerated account of the "leakage" which Sir Horace quotes from Father Shinnors, who little more than passed through it giving missions, and whose knowledge of it must be superficial. But, of England I can speak

to some extent. I have been on the mission in the Archdiocese of Westminster for some years. I lived in different parts of it; attended during the time two large hospitals, a large infirmary and a workhouse. The necessity of the case must be my excuse for publishing that I visited every house, and in tenement houses every room, in the districts where I lived—non-Catholic as well as Catholic, in order to find out the Catholics. Having made my census, I kept repeating my visits as priests usually do. I still preserve the census I then made. Now, in the course of that sifting I do not remember having met one Irish-born Catholic who had really lost the faith. Many had grown careless in the practice of it, but that is quite another thing. I remember one with a very Irish name who was thought by his neighbours not to be a Catholic, for some time after his arrival in their neighbourhood. I visited his house, saw himself, and asked him if he was a Catholic. "No, Sir," was the reply, with the door ajar and his head half through. I said to him—"Now, perhaps you mean that you are a bad Catholic?" At once he brightened up and said "That's right, Father—I am a careless and bad 'un; worse luck." The poor fellow had been careless, though not very much so, and he speculated on the denial as the best way of escaping the importunity of the priest. But his faith was as firm as my own. I believe that the "leakage" in England, such as it is, has mostly come through the children of mixed marriages brought up in indifference, and through orphan or pauper children who, having been sent to Protestant Poor Law institutions, were not brought up in their own faith. And when I say that many Irish emigrants in England have grown careless in the practice of their religion, I mean that they neglect to go to the Sacraments, not that they object to go, as if denying the duty. The Irish emigrants in England have been for

the most part the poorest of the poor. They did not go to America or Australia because they could not afford the passage-money. They found themselves penniless and strangers in some large English city, and consequently had to live in the lowest lanes and alleys, in a physical and moral atmosphere so different from their surroundings at home and from the pure air that blew across their native hills. Moreover, priests, churches and schools were few and far between. They found themselves few in the midst of many, and few of those many ever left their homes on a Sunday morning to go to any place of worship. They found themselves lost in the midst of surroundings where they noticed no pulse of religious life ever beating. I am not now writing hearsay; I write what I know; and considering their circumstances, the wonder to me has always been, not that so many of them have neglected the practice of their faith, as that so many have remained faithful to it. I own that the spiritual wilderness through which I daily passed had a depressing influence on the activity of my own faith. And let me not be understood to say that the negligent never go to their religious duties; they do go, though not often; but in case of illness the most careless often become the most conscientious and careful. Hence, I conclude that Sir Horace cannot find in the fate of Irish emigrants in England the proof of their want of "character and *morale*" which he thought he had found in it. By the way, if losing one's faith be a sign of want of character, multitudes in England, the home of "strenuous qualities," have little of it. I have known whole streets and lanes where the only inhabitants who thought of any place of worship were the Irish Catholics who resided there. With that fact before us—and I am writing what I know—I now invite Sir Horace to apply his own test of

character and *morale* to English Protestants living amidst the surroundings of their birth, not emigrants cast, few, penniless, and strangers, in the midst of multitudes. I could give instances from my own experience of Protestant husbands or wives becoming Catholics owing to the influence or example of their Irish-Catholic partners, and of poor Irish workingmen and women bringing Protestant neighbours or acquaintances to the priest to be instructed. I remember one poor old Englishman, living in one of the lanes about Clare Market, off the Strand, who asked me to receive him into the Church. Whilst I was instructing him, I once asked him why he desired to be a Catholic, and his reply was:—"When I was a young man, sir, I had a chum—he was an Irishman—a Roman Catholic. He's a good bit dead now—a very good man he was, sir—a very good man, sir—and I thought as I should belong to that man's religion, and I want to die in it."

Sir Horace is good enough to avow that in Ireland "open defections from Roman Catholicism are rare." Now, to my mind, that spontaneous avowal, with its apparent impartiality, is one of the most blameable expressions in his book. The *open* defections are rare! But the *secret* defections—how many are they? That is the plain implication. I do not deny the possibility of such cases and of such persons. Judas was one of the Twelve, and his apostacy was not a case of *open* defection; he was at Communion with the other Apostles at the Last Supper, and he kissed his Saviour even later on. Is the notorious compiler of "Five Years in Ireland," one of them? For looking over that compilation, the fact which appeared to me to be specially obtruded, brought out as in *alto relievo* from the whole picture, is that he is a "Roman Catholic." If they are of that class, we make a present of them, or rather we return them with thanks, to the "simpler Christianity," in the

Institutions of which they were brought up, and in which they learned their "Catholic" teaching, besides their "character and *morale*." There are some "*open* defections" from the faith in Ireland, but they are "*rare!*" I do not deny it. Every tree in the course of a long life produces branches which, not absorbing and assimilating the sap, die by degrees, and finally fall rotten to the ground from the living trunk. A very distinguished Canon of the Anglican Church, Sydney Smith, said that the only accessions which Protestantism gets from the Catholic Church are the weeds which the Pope throws over his garden wall. And those "open defections from Roman Catholicism" in Ireland have, as far as I know, invariably taken place under suspicious circumstances. In the "bad times" those defections were spasmodic, and were never very numerous. But where are all the Mick McQuaid converts of West Kerry and Connemara, who during the famine went over to the "simpler Christianity," to have their souls saved, with their bodies in the bargain? How long did they stay in the school of their new Apostles? I believe that Dean White had the joy of receiving back to the fold the last remaining "convert" of Carrigaholt, who, like the others who had preceded him homewards, had been decoyed away by bread and soup when the weakness of hunger was upon him. Not far from where I spent my boyhood there used to be a warren of those "converts;" it lasted but a short while, and it lay desolate even beyond my memory. One or two who held fast by their new faith were appropriately "planted" on small freeholds on the slope of Knockfierna, the retreat of all "the good people." I used to hear persons speak of them, and I remember in my early boyhood looking with mystified feelings towards that historic hill across the valley where I lived, wondering what sort of beings those two

strange races were—the fairies, and the few solitary "converts" who had their home there. In good time those few also, I am told, turned homewards, like the "converts" of Carrigaholt and elsewhere. Sir Horace will, I am sure, agree with me that those showed character in coming back to that faith in which they inwardly believed, and which they had only externally forsaken. And when they were leaving the faith of their fathers "for the time being," I would ask him which showed the worse "character and *morale?*"—those poor perverts of famine and infamy, or the thousands of wealthy subscribers who, taking advantage of the famine created by themselves, although they used to throw the blame of it on God, paid for Bible-readers and proselytisers to persuade those poor people that "not in bread alone doth man live,"—but in meat also? These are not proofs of industrial character, I admit; they show character, nevertheless. And before I leave this point I wish to give Sir Horace a few thoughts for meditation. If Irish Catholics became as industrial as he would wish to see them, had acquired all those strenuous qualities which form his ideal man, and if withal they came to disregard their faith and lose the prestige for morality which they have earned for themselves, raising for instance their percentage of illegitimates as high as the English, the Scotch, or the industrialists of Ulster, would he then think them a people of "character and *morale?*" He seems to me to be colour-blind as to the meaning of "character," and an earnest meditation on that point may cure him.

Another proof of want of "character and *morale*" in Irish Catholics he finds in their abuse of intoxicating drink. He deals with this question also in relation to economics and character; and he says—"I do not think it unfair to insist on the large responsibility of the clergy for the state of public opinion in this matter, to which

the few facts I have cited bear testimony." I wonder is there any Irish evil at all, social, industrial, economic, or moral, for which the priests are not responsible. But let us consider the "few facts" to which he refers. He admits that "the Roman Catholic clergy have an honourable record amongst temperance reformers." He also admits that the Irish drink less than the English or the Scotch. But he adds that we can afford it less:—The economics of the question come in here. But he says that "police statistics as well as common experience discloses that we drink more to intoxication" than they do. Does he mean to say that nobody gets drunk to intoxication except those whom the police catch "incapable" in the streets? If he thinks so, he must either have passed his life in a hermitage, or passed through life without observing what goes on around him. Yet, those are the only cases of which police statistics or common experience can take note. And having thus deceived himself by his use of "police statistics and common experience," he proceeds to establish still more the temperate habits of our neighbours by pointing out that "many a temperate man drinks more than the village drunkard." I admit the axiom; but I must then call him back to his economics, and ask him if he thinks that, because a man can, without getting drunk, consume a gallon of whiskey with a few bottles of champagne thrown in, within a week, he can therefore afford to pay for it all better than the village drunkard can afford to pay for his few gallons of porter.

He finds another excuse for our neighbours which he thinks the Irish Catholic has not; namely, "The Irishman is, in my belief, physiologically less subject to the craving for alcohol than the Englishman, a fact which is partially attributable, I should say, to the less animal dietary to which he is accustomed." Now, physiologically there is a keener craving for stimulants inherent in

women than in men, as anyone must know who has ever tried to wean a woman from drink. Therefore, following Sir Horace's physiological philosophy, we are to conclude that they eat more meat. I should rather say on the other hand that the texture of the Irishman's constitution is more nervous and delicate, and is more disposed to that excitement which the use of alcohol provides.

Again, he tells us that "by far the greater portion of the drinking which retards our progress is of a festive character. It takes place at fairs and markets, and sometimes, even yet, at 'wakes,' those ghastly parodies on the blessed consolation of religion in bereavement." And this he says "is intensified by the almost universal sale of liquor in country shops 'for consumption on the premises'; an evil in defence of which nothing can be said, but it has somehow escaped the effective censure of the Church." I have never heard of any ecclesiastical censure on licences for the sale of drink, to be consumed in or out of the premises; and what has not existed can have been neither effective nor ineffective. Evidently Sir Horace does not understand the scope or meaning of ecclesiastical censures; for which he is not, of course, to be blamed. I have heard of censures in connection with drink at "wakes" and funerals, and they have been effective to the extent of almost blotting out the abuse. Those who go to fairs and markets, not by proxy, but in person, and whose information on these matters comes by experience and not from floating reports and hearsay, tell us that there is not at all the drinking at fairs and markets that there used to be. But there are, unfortunately, fresh centres around which the curse of drink has been gathering in Ireland. Those are the creameries of the country. Thus, his own solution of an economic problem is breeding another problem to be solved. If they happen to be in or near a village the temptation is ready made; if

they do not approach the publichouse, the publichouse approaches them. A house is built, and a licence is got. Oh! but then, what are the priests doing?—Verily, the people soon cannot choose between Orpingtons and Plymouth Rocks, or take the eggs to market, but the economists and the new-fangled reformers of every sort will cry for the priest, demanding the presence of the local *parochus* to superintend the business. I have known some cases where the parish priest protested against the granting of such licences, and their efforts were effective. I have known other cases where the licences were granted in spite of the priest—and not by Morley magistrates, let me remind those whom it may concern. In justice to the Morley magistrates, with whom it has been the fashion to find fault, I think it well to recall the fact that they are still in a minority, and therefore have not the power to restrict or to extend licences against the will of those who are set up as model magistrates; moreover, that the great increase in the number of public-houses had taken place before the Morley magistrates came. The Recorders of Dublin, Derry, Cork, and Belfast, are not Irish Catholics; they have the control of licences, and yet licences have grown wild in those places.

Now, I ask by what right does Sir Horace hold the priests "largely responsible for the state of public opinion in this matter"?—"*And to which,*" as I have shown, "*the few facts he has cited bear*" no "*testimony*" whatever. One would think that Catholics have the drinking vice to themselves; or that ether-drinking and opium-eating which in Ireland is peculiar to the North, is not more degrading and deadly than whiskey-drinking which the North has also in common with the South. Public opinion in this as in every other thing is the outcome of generations of practice. And who have placed the hall-mark of social respectability on getting

"as drunk as a lord"? I unwillingly refer to this; and I merely invite my readers to learn it from some quotations which I have already made from Lecky and Froude.

I do not say that some of the priests might not have done more determined battle against the drink enemy; but I say that whatever has been done has been done almost exclusively by them; and if their efforts have not made things better than they are, they have kept them from having become a great deal worse.

Sir Horace Plunkett is certainly not to be blamed for not understanding the difficulties against which temperance reformers have to fight, and the amount of effort which is spent in little apparent result. I do not speak of the platform reformers, those who draw up schemes and let others work them, or those who set about solving the problem by sitting down at Committee meetings. Experience has persuaded me that those "temperance reformers" who make most noise do least work. Those who have worked hardest and have achieved most real success, who have persistently worked on individuals one by one—only they can realise the difficulty of the task. Let him consult men like Father P. O'Leary of Cork who has done real work for temperance, and he will learn its difficulties and the constant strain it involves. But he has probably never heard of him as a temperance man, although he has in my opinion done within the limits of a parish more than any man in the United Kingdom for the cause of temperance. He has kept his work within his parish, and he has literally banished drunkenness from it. Hence his work is not known abroad, but it is done withal. Sir Horace attributes the failure of the priests "to deal with a moral evil of which they are fully cognisant to the fact that they do not recognise the chief defect in the character of the people, and to a misunderstanding

of the means by which that character can be strengthened." Now, is it not a strange thing that the priests do not understand the people and their shortcomings as well or a great deal better than he does? For that reason I would respectfully suggest to him the possibility of the mistake and the misunderstanding being all on his side.

But he makes an exception of the Anti-Treating League. He says of it that "it is a happy augury for the future of Ireland that many of the clergy are now leading a temperance movement which shows a real knowledge of the *causa causans* of Irish intemperance." Nobody who knows me will, I think, suspect me of prejudice against or of indifference to any movement directed to the destruction or to the decrease of intemperance. Yet, as one who, I daresay, has more experience in that matter than Sir Horace Plunkett, I may say that whilst I am in full sympathy with the Anti-Treating League, I do not set the same value on it that he does. Even its founder does not claim it to be more than a factor in the work. It is applicable not to those who drink from desire, but to those who easily drink too much on occasion and in company. I think that there is some truth in what a home-spun philosopher from the hills said last year to his parish priest who asked him to join it:—"Yerra, Father, you know that I was never dhrunk in my life. But, sure, that Laigue you have now lets a man get dhrunk as often as he likes, as long as he does it *manely*." It was that poor man's witty way of suggesting that a pledge, the prominent element in which binds a man not to treat another, might easily let him forget to restrict himself in the amount he pays for and drinks. No system is without its weak points. If I have made those observations, it is not because I am at all opposed to the Anti-Treating League, but to show that Sir Horace does not see where its strength or its weakness

lies. His praise of it is merely meant to emphasise the general disregard of the priests for temperance reform. But, taking it on its merits, the credit is due, not to an economist, but to a Wexford priest. Sir Horace also finds that even the Anti-Treating League is not fundamental enough:—"It makes no direct appeal to character, and so acts rather as a cure than as a preventive of our moral weakness." That is to say, let it be granted, as they say in the geometries, that every one of the Irish people unswervingly act up to his resolution not to get drunk, and we shall have a sober Ireland. I quite assent to the proposition. But then, men are not made of cast steel. It is not my business now to propose a remedy. But I know priests who are so successful in their temperance work, considering the obstacles which the licensing laws and many of those who administer them have thrown in the way, that if the temptation to drink were cut down to one-half of what it is by the lessening of public-houses, they would make Ireland as sober as one might hope a people to be; by another way, however, than by the Captain Bobadil method suggested by Sir Horace. As long, however, as temptations in the shape of public-houses meet the eye on every side and at every step, many of our people will fall in their weakness. Irish Catholics, any more than the most perfect Buddhist on earth, do not aspire to the Nirvana in a neighbourhood congested with public-houses.

CHAPTER XV.

HOW THE PRIESTS CAUSE EMIGRATION.

THERE is still another account which he has thought it his duty to settle with the priests in the name of economic Ireland; namely, they cause emigration —without knowing what they are doing, however, he is good enough to say. He traces the connection between cause and effect, as follows. The dulness of life in Ireland causes the people to leave the country; want of amusements causes that dulness of life; the priests cause want of amusements by having discountenanced them; to prevent the association of the sexes has caused the priests to discountenance amusements; and to secure the chastity of their flocks, has caused them to oppose the association of the sexes. That is a chain of far-reaching philosophy; and I now propose to consider how it can bear examination.

It is only fair to him to separate the position he takes up from that taken by the author of *Ireland at the Cross Roads*, an Ulster Protestant named Filson Young. Mr. Young traces not only emigration, but also the increase of lunacy in Ireland to the extravagant chastity of the Catholics; and he says that "a hundred bastards would be a more gracious and healthy sign than a lunatic." I can understand the view of this philosopher when I recall the fact that from 1879 to 1889, there were 322 illegitimate births in Co. Mayo, out of a population of 245,212—how many of these should be assigned to non-Catholics I cannot say, unless I guess by analogy drawn from statistics elsewhere;

and that during the same ten years there were 3,034 illegitimate births in Co. Down, out of a population of 272,107.* It is "more gracious and healthy" to be without a tail than with one, said the fox that had lost his, to other foxes that had kept theirs. I merely add that those who decry and disregard chastity, qualify better for a lunatic asylum than those who practise it. With those observations I pass on to Sir Horace.

* I take the following from an article in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, based on the Registrar-General's returns for Ireland:—"Of the children born, 112,733 or 97·2 per cent. were legitimate. Taking the illegitimate births in their order of magnitude, they are—Ulster, 4·3 per cent.; Leinster, 2·3 per cent.; Munster, 2·2 per cent.; Connaught, 0·9 per cent. As these are in the provinces, we will take the highest and the lowest of the counties in order to show the shame and the glory of Irish womanhood.

The highest in their order of unchastity are:—Antrim, 5·8; Armagh, 5·0; Londonderry, 4·8; Down, 4·5; Tyrone, 4·0; Fermanagh, 3·5; Monaghan, 2·8; Donegal, 2·0; Cavan, 1·6. These nine counties are in Ulster. In Connaught, where the average of illegitimate births is 0·9, there are five counties: Galway, 1·5 per cent.; Sligo, 1·0; Mayo, 0·7; Roscommon, 0·7; Leitrim, 0·6 In chastity these counties represent the flower of womanhood. Let us consider the meaning of these figures. In 1,000 persons in Banff, Scotland, there are 171 bastards; in Shropshire, 85 bastards; in Antrim, 58 bastards; in Leitrim, 6 bastards. If female chastity be virtue, then the above figures show the relative proportions between the virtue of the women of the four counties named.

What can give rise to the great difference between the chastity of the greater portion of the women of Ulster and those of the other parts of Ireland? Dividing Ulster into two portions, Protestants and Catholics, and judging these by the numbers of Protestant and Catholic marriages celebrated last year, we find the proportions to be per cent.:—

	Protestants.	Catholics.	Illegitimate Births.
Antrim ...	80	20	5·8*
Down ...	73	27	4·5*
Londonderry ...	60	40	4·8*
Fermanagh ...	54	46	3·5
Tyrone ...	53	47	4·0
Monaghan ...	34	66	2·8
Cavan ...	27	73	1·6
Donegal ...	22	78	2·0

The counties marked (*) returned Orange Members to the present Parliament. It seems that Orangeism and illegitimacy go together, and that bastards in Ireland are in proportion to the Orange Lodges. No other county in Ireland returns an Orangeman."

He says* that "in the inculcation of chastity the success of the Irish priesthood is, considering the conditions of present life and the fire of the Celtic temperament, absolutely unique. No one can deny that almost the entire credit of this moral achievment belongs to the Roman Catholic Clergy." I add the following words which Froude spoke in one of his lectures in New York, in 1872. They were spoken in a lecture directed against Catholic Ireland in general and against the priests in particular. Those were the lectures to which Father Burke replied during his famous American tour:—"I do not question the enormous power for good which has been exercised in Ireland by the modern Catholic priest. Ireland is one of the poorest countries in Europe, yet there is less theft, less cheating, less house-breaking, less robbery of all kinds than in any country of the same size in the civilized world . . . . In the last hundred years impurity has been almost unknown in Ireland. This absence of vulgar crime, and this exceptional delicacy and modesty of character are due, to their everlasting honour, to the influence of the Catholic clergy." Sir Horace thinks that chastity has become so much like second nature to Irish Catholics that "a gradual relaxation of the disciplinary measures by which it is insured might be safely allowed without any danger of lowering the high standard of continence which is general in Ireland, and which, of course, it is of supreme importance to maintain." I wonder would he apply that canon to any other treasure in his possession which he thought of *"supreme importance"* to secure. I also take leave to suggest that those who, according to himself, have done so much to form that chaste character in the Catholics of Ireland, might be better authorities than he or those others who criticise them, as to the best method of preserving it. The presumption is, at any

* Page 115.

rate, on the side of those who have admittedly done so much in this matter; although there is a vast amount of presumption, but of another kind, on the side of their critics who have done nothing, unless to place obstacles, or to find fault. I do not at all agree with Sir Horace's sliding-scale system of morals. Neither does St. Paul; who, even after his heavenly visions, said that there was a "thorn in his flesh," and that "there is a law in our members that wars against the law that is in our mind." But then St. Paul was not aware that Irish Catholics are made of alabaster. I am living with a priest who has a total abstinence sodality of about 1,700 women, the great majority of whom have been very faithful to their pledge since the sodality was started a dozen years ago. On this sliding-scale principle, might he loosen the discipline a little? Take away the system of sections and prefects through which the sodality is organized? In fact tell them that, as they are such confirmed abstainers they may now lean on their acquired virtue without a pledge or a sodality to sustain them? Although I much admire the natural virtue of Cato of Utica, of Epictetus, and of Marcus Aurelius, I cannot follow Sir Horace quite into the School of the Stoics. Chastity is as delicate as the lily, and as easily tarnished.

He writes—"This kind of discipline, unless when really necessary, is open to the objection that it eliminates from the education of life, especially during the formative years, an essential of culture—the mutual understanding of the sexes." I have no fault to find with the views expressed in that passage. But, as it stands, it is only a thesis, which determines nothing for or against the discipline which he condemns. The practical question is, what discipline is, and what is not necessary? From whom, then, am I to learn? From Sir Horace, Filson Young, and other outside ethicians?

or from the parish priests who, after a formal course of Ethics and Moral Theology, have matured their speculative knowledge by long experience? Let us then be empiric, and try to learn from fact. The non-Catholics of Ireland, England, Scotland, America and Australia, are not subjected to this mistaken discipline during their formative years. They learn what he calls "the pathology of the emotions," and are rightly educated into that "culture" of which he speaks—"the mutual understanding of the sexes." Well, then, their formative years are passed, and what is the result? I call himself to witness; I call Froude to witness; I call to witness the statistics of illegitimacy; of what is known in New England as "fashionable murders;" of matrimonial infidelities which overwhelm the divorce courts of those countries; of sexual unnaturalness which threatens to depopulate them. A physician of long experience wrote in the "Boston Medical and Surgical Journal" for 1879—"I have never known an Irish mother, no matter how poor, or how many little ragged children around her, that did not receive every new-born babe with emotions and expressions of gratitude as a blessed gift from God. This sentiment, however rudely expressed, has never failed to win my admiration, and I take pleasure in pointing it out as the finest trait of Irish female character."

Now, then, of what precisely does he complain? Of the following:—"There are," he writes, "many parishes where in this matter the strictest discipline is vigorously enforced. Amusements, not necessarily or even often vicious, are objected to as being fraught with dangers which would never occur to any but the rigidly ascetic or the puritanical mind. In many parishes the Sunday cyclist will observe the strange phenomenon of a normally light-hearted peasantry marshalled in male and female groups along the road, eyeing one another in

dull wonderment across the forbidden space through the long summer day."

It is regrettable to find Sir Horace falling, in that passage also, to the level of the common anti-clerical critic. He suggests much, and specifies nothing. But I think I can define his indefiniteness. Of course he does not refer to golf, for Catholic peasants cannot play it; and if I am rightly informed, it would be well if some influence curbed the conduct of some of those who do play it. A gentleman has told me that urchins in the neighbourhood of golf-links are demoralised by them, inasmuch as they are utilised as errand boys while they should be at school, and because they learn more than their prayers from the golfers. He cannot refer to hurling or football, since they are the luxury of one sex only. He can hardly refer to the various amusements which come under the Gaelic Revival, since priests are amongst the warmest patrons of these. How then does he make the priests responsible for "the strange phenomenon of a normally light-hearted peasantry marshalled in male and female groups, eyeing one another in dull wonderment across the forbidden space the long summer day?" The plain meaning of his words is that the local priest marshals them into several groups, and forbids them to come closer to one another than the breadth of the road. But he does not mean, I suppose, anything so absurd. The priest who would or could do that might satisfy his "puritanical mind" much more easily and efficaciously by dispersing them altogether. I am inclined to think that most of those peasant boys and girls pass their lives much more happily than many of those Sunday cyclists who affect pity for them. I suppose that those boys and girls gathered into groups together according to their taste or pleasure. Their taste appears not to have pleased those Sunday cyclists, but it pleased themselves; and to please

oneself is pleasure. On the other hand, the nerves of these peasants might allow them little pleasure or rest if they had to sit out and listen to small talk over an afternoon tea, although that would probably make Sir Horace's Sunday cyclists supremely happy. I neither praise nor blame either side; "let each abound in his own sense;" the taste of each is pleasure to each. Sir Horace and the cyclists would probably smile at the undeveloped thoughts of those peasants, and those peasants would possibly smile at some developed thoughts of Sir Horace and the cyclists, just as the old woman whom I interviewed thanked God that she was not so ignorant as the Author of "Father Clancy." And what do those Sunday cyclists know of the feelings which govern those country folk whom they spin past at the rate of ten miles an hour? How many of those Sunday cyclists are merely qualifying as *bona-fide* travellers "to enjoy themselves?" Do they bring to, or find more happiness in, their homes in the evening than do those country people whom they pity? These perhaps enjoy life in their own simple and quiet way a great deal more than Sir Horace or his Sunday cyclists think; possibly more than he or his Sunday cyclists themselves. The life of the Acadians was monotonous, but their bliss is proverbial:—

Men whose lives glided on like rivers that watered
the woodland,
Darkened by shadows of earth, but reflecting the
image of heaven.

And of those Irish peasants who betake themselves in after life to some city at home or abroad, how many keep ringing in their memories—

"Full many a path I've tried since then,
Through pleasure's flowery maze,
But ne'er could find the bliss again,
I felt in those sweet days."

Persons who have passed their lives in a city, or whose lives have been distracted by the hurry of business, or by the turmoil of politics, cannot realise the pleasure of a quiet country life because their dispositions have been formed in other ways; and I would myself find the country lonely, although I may live as a solitary in a city. But that does not measure the feelings of those who have passed their lives in the country, whose habits have been formed there, and whose interests are centred there. Happiness to some persons is a sort of Jack-o'-lantern; their happiness never reaches beyond the hope of finding it, but they waste away their lives in the pursuit. They mistake hunting after happiness for the thing itself—they are the Micawbers of pleasure. St. Francis de Sales, one of the wisest and most accomplished men of modern times, writes in his crisp way, " It is easy to discern the gaiety of a light head from the gaiety of a light conscience."

I presume then that what Sir Horace is driving at is this latest war-cry raised by the secular Salvationists of Ireland against the priests—Oh, you priests! you curse of our country! You obscurantists! you despots of our beautiful peasantry! Why did you rob our country life of its charm by killing cross-roads dancing? You have laid the " rigidly ascetic " hand of death upon that fine old pastime of the people, and your " puritanical mind" has cast a cloud over the sunshine of their lives. And then, " Oh! for the days of the Kerry dancing," is caught up as a Jeremiad by a chorus of fangled philanthropists who, till quite recently, have shown very little care for the people or their pastimes; nor do they really care a whit more now than they have ever cared. And the irony of this tragi-comedy is that most of those who are raising this and other like cries belong to a class with such strong Sabbatarian proclivities that, as happened in the case of the Banbury cat, they would

almost pass sentence of death on one of those useful animals for pursuing its domestic avocations on a Sunday.

Now, it is a curious thing that before the "bad times" the dance-stage was to be seen, and "the ring of the piper's tune" was to be heard more generally than it has ever since been heard on Sunday afternoons throughout Ireland. The people had their dance in the afternoon at the cross-roads or beside the bridge, or at their homes in the night time, without let or hindrance; and I have never heard that the parish priest even expected that under ordinary circumstances they should consult him or ask his permission. For the dominant note in the religion of Catholics is love, hope, and joy; in contrast to the religion of non-Catholics, the dominant note of which is pietistic solemnity and fear. St. Francis de Sales writes that one of his books which was "approved by the most grave Prelates and doctors of the Church did not escape the rude censure of some who did not merely blame me but bitterly attacked me in public because I tell Philothea that dancing is an action indifferent in itself, and that for recreation's sake one may make *quodlibets.*"* Gaiety naturally becomes an Irish Catholic; it sits sorrowfully on his neighbours, and somehow presents the appearance of awkward artificiality. How then has it happened that those dances have become so rare which were once so common? If persons tell me that it is because the priests objected to them, they will also have to tell me how it happened that the priests did not object to them before the famine times, when the people danced as they listed, and when the priest's influence over the social relations of his parishioners was much more unquestioned than it is now; when they would have only

* *The Love of God.*—Preface, page 14.

to say the word, and dancing was dead in every parish in the country. The fact is, cross-roads dancing began to fall away when the famine bent the spirit of the people; then came evictions when homes were broken up, and families were dispersed:—

> Scattered like dust and leaves, when the mighty blasts of October
> Seize them, and whirl them aloft, and sprinkle them far o'er the ocean.

Then came a terrible struggle for life between those who remained, which warped or broke the old bonds of friendship that had bound families together as one, without formality or suspicion. I was not then born; but I will let the late A. M. Sullivan describe the social transformation which followed those events; he witnessed it all, and he knew the people well, much better than their present critics. "It is impossible for anyone who knew the country previous to that period, and who has thoughtfully studied it since, to avoid the conclusion that so much has been destroyed, or so greatly changed, that the Ireland of old times will be seen no more. The losses will, I would fain hope, be in a great degree repaired; the gains entirely retained. Yet much that was precious was engulfed, I fear, beyond recovery. 'Here are twenty miles of country, sir,' said a dispensary doctor to me, 'and before the famine there was not a padlock from end to end of it.' Under the pressure of hunger, ravenous creatures prowled under barn and storehouse, stealing corn, potatoes, cabbage, turnips—anything, in a word, that might be eaten. Later on the fields had to be watched, gun in hand, or the seed was rooted up and devoured raw. This state of things struck a fatal blow at some of the most beautiful traits of Irish rural life. It destroyed the simple confidence that bolted no door; it banished

for ever a custom which throughout the island was of almost universal obligation—the housing for the night, with cheerful welcome, of any poor wayfarer who claimed hospitality. Fear of 'the fever,' even where no apprehension of robbery was entertained, closed every door, and the custom, once killed off, has not revived. A thousand kindly usages and neighbourly courtesies were swept away. When *sauve qui peut* had resounded throughout a country for three years of alarm and disaster, human nature becomes contracted in its sympathies, and 'everyone for himself' becomes a maxim of life and conduct long after. The open-handed, open-hearted ways of the rural population have been visibly affected by the 'Forty-seven' ordeal. Their ancient sports and pastimes everywhere disappeared, and in many parts of Ireland have never returned. The outdoor games, the hurling match, and the village dance are seen no more."* Aubrey de Vere, in his *Reminiscences*, gives a pathetic description of the change; and if all of his class were disposed as his family was, and lived as his family lived, in friendly intercourse with the people, the tide of emigration would not have come as it came; cross-roads dancing might be in evidence to-day as much as ever, and the old informal hospitality of which A. M. Sullivan speaks would have left the door of every peasant unbolted. When the land-war came, the pity is that such men were made to suffer with those whose unyielding selfishness brought it on.

As the population became sparse, and the youth of the country were departing, cross-roads dancing and other rural pastimes gradually disappeared. Then came the three waves of political agitation which have stirred the country since the great exodus began. A continued series of monster meetings drew the young men Sunday after Sunday, from year to year, to the

* *New Ireland.*—Chap. VI., pages 67-68.

political centres, and kept their thoughts turned from local amusements. Passing along the country during the past few years, I have seen a few dance platforms lying against the road-side fences, a sign that they are still used on Sundays. But, I have more than once asked persons living in the country why these dances are not so common as they used to be, and the answer has invariably been—"Oh! the people are all gone—There are no people in the country now." When Sir Horace and other critics tell me that cross-roads dancing has disappeared because it was stopped by the priests, I invite them to tell me also by whom was hurling and football stopped? There was surely no sexual danger in those amusements that could trouble the conscience of the most puritanical priest; yet they also had well nigh disappeared for many years. Would not the same causes account for the disappearance of cross-roads dancing? The truth is that the purity of Irish Catholics is an eye-sore to their critics, because it is a rebuke. It is a living fact which they dare not deny, whilst it is a standing reproof which they cannot bear. Hence the flat philosophy, and the tears specially shed over that one departed pastime which gives it colour.

If cross-roads dancing prevailed at present as it once prevailed over the Catholic parts of Ireland, and if statistics at the same time showed Co. Mayo to be more immoral than Co. Down, those critics who now shed tears over the departed pastime and who accuse the clergy of having killed it, would then denounce them for having let it live. Very little they care for cross-roads dancing, or for any other of those popular amusements whose disappearance they pretend to regret. With them it is a game of "heads I win, tails you lose;" but I willingly withdraw Sir Horace Plunkett from the class to whom I allude. Our critics have

very short or very convenient memories. The only persons who have ever tried to positively put down cross-roads dancing were they whose representatives to-day shed crocodile tears that those popular amusements have disappeared, who rise in their indignation to curse the clergy for having destroyed them. I wonder is Sir Horace aware that in 1820 and the following years, those who ruled the people then with a monopoly of power, absolutely forbade cross-roads dancing, and summarily whipped whoever gathered together to dance in defiance of their orders. Perhaps those prohibitions were not directed against dances on their own account, but as meetings for Whiteboyism or to promote O'Connell's agitation; the purpose of the prohibition was not to prevent amusement but to prevent disloyalty to the law. Our critics will see in that a justification of the prohibition. Very well then. But can they not see that a parish priest is immeasurably more justified in preventing a dance when in his judgment there is danger of disloyalty to God? According to the ethics of our critics and their class, to sin against their rule is evil; to sin against God is only pleasure. Quite so; I understand them.

I must not be understood as saying that the priests have never opposed dancing. I have no doubt that they have often done so; not, however, because of the dancing, but because of some evils connected with particular cases; and I know that in many such cases the objection comes first from the parents of the young people, who make complaints to the priest. Perhaps those dangers have been in some cases more imaginary than real. If that be so, the priests who happened to be mistaken acted I suppose according to their light, just as the economists and the industrial specialists act even when they make mistakes. If a priest stops a dance in any parish up or down the country, and

thinks he is right in doing so, how in the name of reason can Sir Horace or his Sunday cyclists undertake to say that he has done wrong? "Oh! but persons told them who know," he will reply. Indeed! and the priest who did the deed knew nothing? When Sir Horace has heard of any such case, has he ever asked the parish priest what *he* had to say? Whether those priests have been mistaken in any or in many such cases, I do not know; but I do know that a priest who is responsible for the moral character of his parish, and who knows intimately the local influences at work there, can form a much safer judgment on such a question than any outsider can. At any rate, I would not like to commit myself to the foolishness of passing sentence on the action of any responsible man acting officially, under circumstances which he knew well, and of which I knew nothing. I take the following from *The New York Freeman's Journal**:—"Chief of Police Murphy, of Jersey City, issued an order, Monday, to the precinct commanders directing that hereafter no girls without male escorts be allowed to attend dances where liquor is sold, and no girls under sixteen be permitted to attend such dances whether escorted or not.

This order followed an inspection of dance halls on Saturday night. Chief Murphy found a number of young girls whom he sent to their homes, after taking their ages, names and addresses.

In the order, the chief says that in some of these places disgraceful scenes are witnessed. Girls under sixteen go unaccompanied by male escorts, paying their own entrance fees. In most of these dance halls liquor and beer are sold either on the floor or so adjacent to the hall that it might as well be in the hall. This

* February 4th, 1905.

condition of affairs is highly demoralizing to the youth of our city."

Would Sir Horace think it right to condemn the action of Mr. Murphy on the evidence of those who organise those dances?

Let me suppose that I paid a visit to the Department in Dublin, and after a superficial inspection, condemned the arrangements of the place, I wonder what would Sir Horace say—well, politeness would, I expect, prevent him from saying all he thought. A friend of mine remarked to me not long ago that wherever a dance has disappeared from where it used to be, it is either owing to the fact that the young people of the place have become too few, or because the parish priest opposed it on account of some scandal or the danger of one, or because the local fiddler died. I have never heard of a priest who objected to a dance from pure prejudice against dancing in itself. But if there be any such priest, I differ from him as widely as Sir Horace does, except with regard to certain kinds of dance which I think are graceless without being graceful. Priests have sometimes also set their face against certain hurling and football matches, but not certainly because of any moral evils involved in those athletics. Quite recently the Bishop of Kildare wrote a strong protest against some sports which were announced to take place in a town of his diocese; but surely his Lordship did not denounce them for any evil he saw in the athletics themselves; he sent in fact a subscription towards some sports held in the same place about the same time. A priest who has actually fitted up a dancing apartment in connection with a Women's Total Abstinence Institute for the use of the members and their friends, tells me that he stopped a dance in a parish where he lived some years ago. There was another dance in the same place which he in no way discouraged;

nevertheless it gradually died from natural causes, partly because of a dwindled population, and partly because of the political meetings which became a greater attraction for the young men. There is an instructive lesson to be read in facts like these, if critics will only read and learn it.

So far, Sir Horace has been speaking from hearsay, or in theory. "But of my own knowledge," he adds, "I can only speak of another aspect of the effect upon our national life of the restriction to which I refer. No Irishmen are more sincerely desirous of staying the tide of emigration than the Roman Catholic Clergy, and while, wisely as I think, they do not dream of a wealthy Ireland, they earnestly work for the physical and material as well as the spiritual well-being of their flocks. And yet no man can get into the confidence of the emigrating class without being told by them that the exodus is largely due to a feeling that the clergy are, no doubt from an excellent motive, taking joy—innocent joy—from the social side of home life."

That is the final link in the chain of reasoning by which he shows how the priests cause emigration. He is good enough to give them credit for "excellent motives," and he exonerates them from guilt inasmuch as they do not consider the consequences of their action. He blames not their guilt but their innocence. Now, let me speak plainly—Sir Horace shall not hide himself under those cheap condescensions by which he apologises for the priests. I know not their motives; I deal with their actions. Their motives affect themselves alone; their actions affect the public. His condescension which excuses them for their motives, asserts all the more strongly by implication that his criticism on their conduct is right.

I live in a parish the Catholic population of which is about 22,000. The district which I am told off to

look after is the poorest and most populous part of it. I think I know that district better than anyone living. I have made a thorough census of it, which I have revised three times over, and in some parts several times. My census contains, besides other things, the occupation of the adults and the ages of the children. The purpose of my argument must be my excuse for mentioning these details. I am here now several years; I am daily amidst the poor; they daily make known to me their trials, and give me their confidences—more confidences than, I am sure, they would give Sir Horace or his Sunday cyclists. I have known many of them who have emigrated within that time; some of whom have come to me before they left, others I have blest in their homes. Their families are living here still, and I meet them every day. Now, it is a curious fact that none of those emigrants, nor any member of their families whom they have left behind, has even once confided to me the secret that they left for want of amusement at home. They left chiefly for want of work at home; and I am surprised that a professed economist is not satisfied with that simple cause of emigration, without fishing for its philosophy in the realms of poetry. As far as I know, such a secret has not been confided to any of the priests with whom I live, nor to any priest in the country. It cannot be through fear of appearing to reprove us for "taking joy —innocent joy—from the social side of their home life." For, besides the Women's Temperance House which I have already mentioned, there is in the parish a large Total Abstinence Society for men, carefully looked after by another priest, in which the members have various means of amusement, including a boat-club, and can have dancing whenever they desire it. Yet the people emigrate, and they never confide to us the cause to which, we are told by Sir Horace, their "exodus is

largely due." If he make an impartial enquiry he will find that, by a strange irony, his own co-operative movement, in some of its phases at least, has helped the tide of emigration to no inconsiderable extent. I do not find fault with the movement for that reason; those consequences are inevitable; creameries for instance are not the less necessary because they lessen the number of hands required by farmers, and thus cause some to emigrate who would otherwise be employed at home.

I am not to be understood as implying that priests should inaugurate schemes for the amusement of the people. That is not a priest's business; it is not the business of anyone except of those who want to amuse themselves. Amusement is spontaneous, else it is not amusement; and those who, when they may, will not start it, do not desiderate it; at least, will not run away to America for want of it. Has Sir Horace ever reflected on how a Presbyterian spends Sunday? Yet, many of them have emigrated from the North, and not surely, in search of Sunday amusement, or from want of it.* Who ever heard of a Protestant longing for amusement on the Sabbath? I have no doubt that some persons are induced to emigrate by the flattering letters

* The following are taken from the Blue Laws, inspired by the "Simpler Christianity" of New England. "The Court . . . do therefore order that whoever shall profane the Lord's Day, by doing unnecessary servile works, by unnecessary travelling, or by *sports and recreations*, he or they that so transgress shall forfeit for every such default forty shillings, or be publicly whipt."

"21.—No one shall run on the Sabbath Day, or walk in his garden or elsewhere, except reverently to and from meeting.

"22.—No one shall travel, cook victuals, make beds, sweep house, cut hair or shave on the Sabbath Day.

"23.—No woman shall kiss her child on the Sabbath or Fasting Day.

"160.—It is enacted by the Court that any person or persons that shall be found smoking tobacco on the Lord's Day, going to or from meetings, within two miles of the meeting-house, shall pay twelve pence for every such default to the Colony's use."

they get from their friends; and in that way, emigration may to some extent, be caused by the promised pleasures of life abroad. But the same influence attracts persons from the country into the towns and cities at home. The same influence has depopulated some of the country parts of England, having drawn the people into the cities. From the nature of things, the country cannot supply that variety of distractions which are to be found either in American or in Irish cities. If Sir Horace or his Sunday cyclists set about providing Irish country districts with amusements to rival those of New York or Boston, I should be curious to know how they would do it. The majority of Irish emigrants, in leaving Ireland for America, are running away not from loneliness in search of pleasure, but they are simply answering an American letter which contained their passage ticket. I think that the passage ticket causes a great many more to emigrate than the dulness of home life or the promised pleasures of the States. The parish priest of a country parish, who takes a very wide interest in his people, has told me that he has kept a list of the emigrants from his parish during the last two years, and of these only two paid their own passage; and he shrewdly and truly added that, "giving those who thus tempt the people with passage tickets and flattering promises credit for the best intentions, they are the greatest Emigration Agents we have." My friend anticipated the Registrar-General. Hitherto no statistics have been made out to show how many go to America on prepaid passage tickets. Such statistics have just been given for the first time, and they inform us that of 12,784 emigrants to the United States during the June quarter of this year, 5,204 have gone on passage tickets sent from America. Besides those, a considerable number emigrate, paying their own passage

out of money sent from America for that purpose. Therefore, at least, one half of those who go to America at present are tempted away from home by the sight of the passage ticket and the passage money, and by the fancy pictures of Lagenian mines which are exhibited in the American letter, but which are seldom realised by those who go across, "allured by the gleam that shone."

I think that what I have written justifies me in concluding that it is not "the deadly dulness of rural life in Ireland" that causes emigration, as it has been phrased by a well-known rhetorical politician, but that it is emigration has caused "the deadly dulness of rural life in Ireland." One would think that country life in Ireland is exceptionally dull, beyond the country parts of England, the backwoods of America, or the Australian Bush. The philosophy of these critics consists in phrases. It is much easier to find out an imaginary cause for an evil than to take the trouble to cure it. To give Sir Horace his merit, he is doing his part; and he would be much more successful than I fear he is likely to be, had he simply taken the needs of the country as they exist, and tried to apply them without telling the public how he thinks they have been caused.

Until lately the cry amongst a certain class of the community was—clear the congested districts by emigration; the priests, against all laws of economics, encourage the unfortunate people to stay in their misery. Now, the cry is—stop emigration, or Erin is no more; the priests are the cause of it all, because they will not let "a naturally light-hearted peasantry" enjoy themselves. Sixty years ago Sir Robert Kane published his book on *The Industrial Resources of Ireland*, and at that time there were, according to him, 4,600,000 acres of waste but improvable waste land in Ireland. At that time the population of the country was double what it is to-day. What happened? Poulett Scrope, in a letter to

Lord John Russell, in 1847, says that there were 500,000 acres of waste land in Co. Mayo which might easily be cultivated if the owners would only let the peasants do it. "But the landowners of Mayo," he says, "prefer driving the people out of the country to America or England, or starving them out of existence, to encouraging them by long leases to settle on waste lands at home. This is why Mayo appears to be over populated, when the contrary, is, or ought to be, the fact." In 1839, a meeting of landlords was held in Loughrea for the purpose of raising funds to benevolently send the "surplus tenants" of the district to Australia. They showed they had "the economic sense." Loughrea was threatened by the Poor Law, which had just been passed. They speculated that it would be cheaper for them to pay for transporting the poorest abroad, than to pay for supporting them at home; and they would have the glory moreover of doing a philanthropic deed. The inhuman fun which they found in the scheme may be read in these words of the chairman, as cruel as they are uncouth:—"We may select that quantity of land in the best situation, and call it Loughrea; and there may be a handsome lake, too, attached to it; and thus, those settlers may fancy themselves still in their dear Loughrea, with their associations and friends about them." The famine cannot be said to have been a factor in that plan of depopulation.

According to Father Lavelle's, *The Irish Landlord since the Revolution*, the number of houses levelled in twenty years (1841-1861) was 270,000; which meant so many families dispersed and gone, the evictor cared not whither. According to the same work, the Marquis of Sligo left not a soul, except a few herds, in wide areas of the West; and "the clearance" tragedies which were enacted in the West, went on more or less in the

East, the South, and the North. The people did not run to America in search of amusement from life's monotony in those parts; but, driven from their homes, they ran there for their lives, and their absence caused "the deadly dulness of the rural life" which they left behind them. From 1840 onwards, when the system of "consolidating lands" was adopted by landowners for the purpose of increasing their rents and of lessening their poor-rates, the number of small farms went on constantly decreasing, and the number of large ones were constantly increasing.

But I have said enough. There is no need for Sir Horace to come before the public, with his philosophy in swaddling-clothes, to seek the cause of Irish emigration elsewhere than in the economic necessity thus artificially made. The root of it is to be found in those facts, of which I have given but a few, for a sample. What thus began in necessity became in time also a custom, and it has now grown into a tradition. Most of the people have friends in America; some have more relatives there than at home. Hence the "American wake" has ceased to be what it once was. The wailing which was once witnessed at the parting of old friends and the separating of families is heard no more. Most of our present emigrants are leaving friends at home only to join others beyond the sea. Children learn from their childhood that their destiny is America; and as they grow up, the thought is set before them as a thing to hope for—Going to America is to be their way of living. And it is so: public wrong has made it stern truth. Children are *intended* for America, as they are *intended* for carpenters, labourers, masons, or smiths. These are facts, not fancies; and he would, I think, have done more wisely to have learned them and faced them straight rather than to have taken the trouble of

thinking out for us that "many of the clergy ignore the vast difference between the ephemeral nature of moral compulsion and the enduring force of real moral training;" which distinction there is not a priest in Ireland, or anywhere else, who does not understand quite as clearly as he does; and very many of them, I am sure, a great deal better. It is a pity he does not reflect that priests and Catholics in general, when their thoughts do not happen to be in harmony with his, may have solid grounds for their judgments and good justification for their ways. That want of reflection has done more damage than the publication of his philosophy could ever do good.

CHAPTER XVI.

WHAT THE GOVERNMENT AND ITS GARRISON IN IRELAND HAVE GIVEN THE PEOPLE IN RETURN FOR WHAT THEY HAVE GOT.

In strictness, no duty devolves on a priest to take an active part in the political or in the industrial work of his country; that is, in normal circumstances. When I made up my mind to become a priest I did not count on having to face such work. On the contrary my natural disinclination from such duties had more to do than any other natural motive in determining the choice of life-work which I made. And am I to be told that I share responsibility as to the material condition of the country if I abstain from work which I expressly set aside on making up my mind to become a priest? One might as well say that a barrister neglects his duty because he does not compound medicine as well as plead causes, or that a physician neglects his duty because he does not plead causes as well as prescribe for patients. And it is a curious inconsistency that those who would most vociferously assert my duty towards such work under one set of circumstances, would under a different set of circumstances not only ignore my duty but even repudiate my right. I do not say that a priest is under all circumstances to be absolved from such public duties. Exceptional circumstances will impose obligations which under normal conditions do not exist. Such circumstances did exist when, in the early part of the last century, the people of Ireland woke up from the lethargy of the penal times, and dared to assert that they had wrongs to redress.

Before that time they had, from sheer helplessness, lapsed into a state of resignation to their fate. It was but natural that the priests took a leading part in working for a removal of religious disabilities. They merely did what they ought to have done. But the political and economic interests of the people came only indirectly in their way; and they would never probably have taken to the political platform if the material interests of the people had not been neglected, ruined, and ignored by those whose business it was to guard them, or if the people's wrongs had been voiced and their cause pleaded by those who had the power, the position, and the gifts to do so. The priests went out of their way and took up the place which those who ought refused to fill, and they have occupied that position down to this day. Why is it that no other persons in the country, taken as a class, are expected to work for the temporal interests of the people? Why is it that no other class are rebuked or abused for not doing so? Why does Sir Horace not upbraid, for instance, the medical or the legal profession as sharing responsibility for the industrial shortcomings of the people? Why not the parsons? He will say that these are not numerous enough? Between Episcopalian, Presbyterian, and Methodist ministers, they number 2,724, for a little over a million Protestants. He will say that these do not belong to the religion of the people? But do they not belong to the country of the people? Indeed, Dr. Bunbury, Dr. O'Hara, Dr. Chadwick, and other Protestant bishops have been assuring the country in chorus that they, and they alone, take a really deep and rational interest in the people. And, descending from a social to a commercial level of thought, they have received vastly more of Irish public money for personal uses than the priests have ever got. The truth is, we have become so accus-

tomed to see the priests interest themselves in the temporal as well as in the spiritual concerns of the people that we have come to look on it as a matter of course and as a matter of duty. Thus, their supposed responsibility in the present is begotten of their free and generous action in the past. Hence it has come to pass that every political, social, or economic evil in the country is laid at their doors, as if those on whom duty as to those things devolves only indirectly and by accident, were the only class in the country who had any duty in the matter, and as if those whose duty as to those things is direct and indisputable at all times, had no duty or responsibility at any time or at all. But, he will say, having such "undisputed influence," they might be reasonably expected to —— yes, they might be reasonably expected to do what is their duty; but he censures them because, having done more than they were bound to do, they have not done still more. One would think that their "undisputed influence" was a gift that dropped down from the moon, and therefore entails responsibility; whereas whatever popular influence they possess has come from their having taken the part of the people, when those who ought and might have done much to relieve the people's wrongs not only ignored but helped to intensify them. Their present popular influence is the result of their popular action in the past, and it is false to infer their duty in public affairs from their popular influence.

I now propose to review what the representatives of Government, the landlords, and the Protestant Church have taken from the country, and to ask what have they done for it in return, politically, industrially, or socially? And 1st as to Government:—

On 26th May, 1800, Grattan, protesting against the relative taxation of England and Ireland arranged by Castlereagh, said that "Ireland, like every enslaved

country, will ultimately be compelled to pay for her own subjugation." And so it has been. Wealth is created by industry, but it is saved by thrift. The Union left Ireland little power to create, and it left her as little power to save. O'Neill Daunt says that the "aggregate drains of income have been estimated by careful enquirers to amount to £13,000,000 per annum"; which means that during the century £1,300,000,000 has been transported from Ireland to England, besides the loss sustained by being deprived of the profits which would have come from the use of it at home. In that estimate are included over-taxation, absentee rents, money spent on English manufactures owing to the destruction of home industries, etc. At the Union the debt of Ireland was only one-sixteenth of the debt of England; but they were soon afterwards assimilated in taxation, and Ireland was made to pay one-seventh as her share of the burden. Thus, from the start instead sharing England's wealth she has shared only her debt. To trace the consequences to the present day, I take the following from an article contributed to *The Nineteenth Century*, for March, 1886, by Mr. Giffen, Secretary to the Statistical Department of the Board of Trade:—"I desire to call special attention to the fact, which has come out incidentally, that Ireland is over-taxed in comparison with Great Britain. It contributes twice its proper share to the Imperial Exchequer."

I should begin with the initial cost in carrying the Union. Twenty-six Members of the Irish Parliament were created peers, for which they sacrificed their country to their selves. £1,500,000 was spent in bribing the holders of pocket boroughs to vote away the independence of their country. Over and above that sum, £60,000 a year was spent on pensions to secure the same treachery. Then, insult was super-added to injustice by saddling the

Irish people with the entire expenditure; that is, they were made to pay the cost of their own degradation. The popular outcry and resistance which was raised by that wrong, made it necessary for the Government to keep up a military force in the country of 137,000 men, at a cost of £4,815,367 a year. For that also the people had to pay. But that does not fill the measure of iniquity; because the soldiers, although their expense had thus been provided for, were for the most part quartered on the people, and the savings thus made were appropriated by the officials of justice and order. Is that a sign of the "economic sense"? At any rate, that is how the Government and those who were paid to distribute justice in the name of law, consulted for the economic interest and for the industrial regeneration of Ireland.

The Report of the Financial Relations Commission has revealed that Ireland has been paying £3,000,000 a year in taxes more than her share. Again, there are in Ireland 12,307 police at a cost of £1,418,562 per annum; besides whom there are 7,142 police pensioners at a cost of £365,476. How they are distributed over the country will be understood from the following:—In Antrim and Down they are 13 to 10,000 of the population; in Armagh they are 15 to 10,000. In Limerick, Tipperary, King's County, Galway and Dublin they are 33; in Meath, 34. In England there are 45,544 police; in Scotland, 5,107. That is to say:—In Ireland a policeman is set to mind every 360 of the population; in England a policeman is considered enough for every 715, and in Scotland for every 885. Yet, in England 8,631 persons were convicted for criminal offences in 1901, and there were 3,112 convicts; in Scotland, 1,872 were convicted for criminal offences, and there were 289 convicts; in Ireland, 1,211 were convicted for criminal offences and there were 261 convicts. And what has government

done for all those expenses imposed? Much less than nothing. Some remedial measures have been passed from time to time; but these only pay off the debt by instalments. But Ireland has never shared that distributive justice according to the taxes she pays; and the remedial measures she has got she has extracted; they have never come from a sense of governmental duty. Dr. Johnson was a prophet when he said to an Irish acquaintance in 1779, "Do not unite with us, sir; we should unite with you only to rob you."

Let us now see what the landlord class have done for the country during the past century.

According to the evidence given before the Exchange Committee in 1804, by Mr. Puget, the remittances from Ireland to absentee landlords at that time were more than £2,000,000 a year. In 1830, according to the evidence of Mr. Ensor, before a Parliamentary Committee, absentee landlords took away annually £4,000,000; or, as he said, one-third of the whole rental of Ireland. He stated, on the authority of Dr. Jebb, the Protestant Bishop of Limerick, a man of note in his day, that £300,000 was thus taken from County Limerick, and £150,000 from County Kerry. Thus the absentee drain on the country was doubled in less than thirty years. Those landlords in being absentees not only helped the prosperity of England and of other countries where they spent their money, but also in the same ratio helped to impoverish their own. There was a *damnum emergens* and a *lucrum cessans*. If their rents had been fair, the loss would have been great, though less. But they left their agents in Ireland to grind out exorbitant rents, and they stayed abroad to spend them. They acted no doubt according to their principles, because they arrogated all rights and disowned all duties towards the country whence they drew their revenues. Ireland was their country in the sense that it belonged to them, but

not in the sense that they belonged to it; and the unguarded confession recently made about "England's faithful garrison in Ireland" reveals the same principle of conduct at work to-day.

Mr. Sadler, an English Tory member of Parliament, in a work published in 1829,* writes:—"Are we still to garrison a defenceless country in behalf of those whose property was, generally speaking, originally conferred on the special condition of residence, but whose desertion occasions all the evils under which she has groaned for centuries—property so treated that it would not be worth a day's purchase were the proprietors its sole protectors. But they are aware that their absence is balanced by the presence of a body of military and police, which enables them to conduct themselves with as little apprehension as remorse. And are these so meritorious a class that their utmost demands are to be extorted from a distant and suffering country, and themselves protected in open neglect, or rather audacious outrage, of all those duties, on the due and reciprocal discharge of which the whole frame of the social system is founded? If they persist in this course, let them do so, but let it be at their own proper peril." Such is the view of an English Protestant of how the landlords who lived abroad contributed to the economics of the country. And how about those who lived at home? According to a non-Catholic paper, *The Dublin Pilot*, of January 2nd, 1833:—"The Irish country gentleman is, we are sorry to say, the most incorrigible being that infests the face of the globe. In the name of the law he tramples on justice; boasting of superiority of Christian creed, he violates Christian charity—is mischievous in the name of the Lord. Were the Irish Government inclined to govern

* *Ireland and its Evils.*

the country with good policy (which, bless its heart! it is not) the greatest impediment it would find would be in the arrogant, besotted, grasping, rack-renting, spend-thrift, poor, proud, and profligate country gentleman." In a speech delivered at a meeting of the Protestant Conservative Society on 12th August, 1834, the Rev. Charles Boyton, the acknowledged leader of that Society, said:—"If honourable gentlemen and noble lords would look to the title-deeds of their estates they would find it was held, too, under conditions, in all cases a condition of residence; in some, as in the grants of James I., with a reservation that they should pay the tithes to the established clergy; and most, on the expressed compact that these estates were to be tilled by a good Protestant tenantry." Possibly when they found that they were neither able to create Irish Protestant tenants nor to keep British ones, they conveniently concluded that the conditions no longer bound them. Hence, Sydney Smith suggested at the same time that the people should do their duty to themselves, since those who also owed a duty to them neglected it. "As long as the patient will suffer, the cruel will kick. If the Irish go on withholding and forbearing, and hesitating whether this is the time for discussion or that is the time, they will be laughed at for another century as fools, and kicked for another century as slaves."

We have seen how they subdivided lands into small plots in order to manufacture votes through the 40s. freeholders. Under that system families multiplied and the population rapidly increased. We have seen how, when those voters had dared to use their natural right in voting as they pleased, their power of voting was stopped. But there they were, with their families, and the population was still increasing. According to an Official Report of 1836, 585,000 men were out of work for 30 weeks in the year. Then was

introduced the system of consolidating lands, which made matters worse. Now, according to Sir Robert Kane, there were 4,600,000 acres of waste but reclaimable land in the country. If the people were encouraged to settle on these, the wastes would have been cultivated, the poor would have employment and their condition would be improved. But neither in that nor in any other way did those who had the power, do anything for the people. Quite otherwise.

Let us look at it in another light. The amount of money accumulated by the people owing to the high prices which prevailed during the Napoleonic wars was enormous. Sir Hussey Vivian, in his evidence before a Select Committee in 1832, estimated the capital of the small farmers at £30,000,000. They were thrifty enough to save it, but they were powerless to use it productively. Some of them committed their savings to the keeping of trustworthy neighbours; others hid them away to keep them more secure from the knowledge of the landlord, who would either demand it on loan, or would make it a pretext for raising the rent. Of course, they did not think of employing it to improve their holdings; they were made helpless, but they would not be fools. Mr. Dixon Holmes, in the course of evidence which he gave before a Select Committee on Public Works in Ireland, in 1835, gives several illustrations to show how much money the people had saved, but which he says "they had to hoard up for want of the means of employing it." He told the Committee, amongst other things, that he had proposed to an extensive Tipperary landlord to buy up a large quantity of waste land from him. He then went to the parish priest of the place and asked him to recommend him some trustworthy persons amongst his people who had money and were ready to invest it in land. After a few weeks the priest sent him a list of persons who had the money and were anxious to take the land.

They proposed to lodge the money in the Provincial Bank at Clonmel, in their own names and in his, to be drawn out for the purpose of being employed on the land as it was wanted. The money contributed amounted to £9,700, ranging from sums of £20 to £600. He found a gentleman in London to join him in the undertaking. They proposed to spend a sum of money on the undertaking, in erecting buildings, making roads, etc., and to require only a fair compensation for the use of it. But when all was ready for work, he found the landlord too unsatisfactory to deal with. His terms were liberal enough, but he would only lease those waste lands for three lives or thirty-one years. That landlord had "the economic sense." He had an eye to eventualities of thirty-one years in the future. That money saved by the people became the misfortune of many, rather than an inducement to save more. The writer of a very able article in *The Dublin Review** says:—"And fatal have been the effects to the peace of families. There is but too much reason to believe, that many an industrious farmer has owed his transportation, in times of disturbance, to the pecuniary accommodation he has afforded to the needy justices of his neighbourhood."

In the meantime the absentee drain went on; in 1843 it amounted to £6,000,000.

Let us pass on to another phase of the question, and to a later date. Mr. Goldwin Smith became one of the multitudinous cheap advisers of Ireland† The great economic black spots he saw in the country were "congested districts" and "surplus population"—that, after more than a generation of "clearances," famine, fever, evictions, and emigration. His panacea was

* For July, 1863.

† *Nineteenth Century* for June, 1883.

to help the people out of the country. The late A. M. Sullivan replied to him,* and pointed out that Ireland was not "congested," although certain districts may be so; and that even in these the congestion was not due to the poverty of nature but to the avarice of man, not to the indolence of the people but to the greed of landlords. Instead of discussing the question in my own words, I give his:—"This Irish misery is no mysterious problem. Irish poverty is created and manufactured before our eyes by a process as simple and direct as the scuttling of a ship. The real wonder would be if Irish farmers as a class were ever much above starvation level. For fifty years past the charge has been specifically urged on their behalf that for time out of mind extortionate rents left them no means of subsistence much above that of cattle. Since Sharman Crawford's time it has been explicitly charged that an excess of £5,000,000 a year has been wrung from them. For eighteen months past this charge has been under investigation in the Queen's Courts by Land Commissioners. In the result, so far, it is judicially declared that the rents have been unfair or extortionate, on an average, to the extent of about 27 per cent. per annum. The rental of Ireland for thirty years past is estimated at £15,000,000 or £16,000,000; so that, at this rate, after allowing a margin for properties fairly rented, a yearly sum of at least £3,500,000, or more than £100,000,000 since 1851 has been wrongfully squeezed out of Irish farmers. Aye, wrung out of them by a process as agonising as the courbash. £100,000,000! How many tragedies of humble life darkened the background of these figures! How much of unrequited toil; how much of cruel injustice, of heart-sinking and hopelessness; of hunger and privation! If this £100,000,000, or even half the amount, were in hand just now for

* In *Nineteenth Century* for July, 1883.

settling Connemara cottiers on depopulated or reclaimable Irish land elsewhere, they would need no help from Mr. Tuke. The lowest computation I have ever seen, but which I have not tested, fixes at another £100,000,000 the net loss—the direct and actual loss—to Ireland in the same period on the disastrous agricultural statistics already cited; while, as if to render inevitable the pauperisation of the country, within the same period the Imperial taxation imposed on and drawn from Ireland has been increased from the yearly amount of £4,006,711 in 1851, to £7,086,593 in 1871. And this was on a falling population. The Imperial taxation of Ireland stood at 12s. 2d. per head for population in 1851. It stood at £1 6s. 2d. per head in 1871—an increase of 14s. per head per year. Within the same period the burden on rich and prosperous Great Britain, with an increasing population, has been lightened by a reduction of 3s. 3d. per head per annum."

I am now, I think, in a position to invite Sir Horace Plunkett to examine his conscience and ask himself—What have the landlords done for the country in return for all they have taken from it? How have they exerted those civic virtues which we are told they possess, or the superior intelligence of which they are for ever boasting, and by reason of which they are for ever asserting their title to privileges? How have they used the privileges, the monopolies, which they have hitherto enjoyed? They originally supplanted the people in their possessions by legalised force, and then, privileged by the same force, they made the people their slaves. They rack-rented, evicted, and "cleared" them off their estates, and after dissipating their extorted revenues abroad and sinking themselves hopelessly into debt, having slept off the intoxication of their lawless power, they drowsily rub the cobwebs from their eyes, wonder that there can be any poverty amongst the people, and can see nothing econo-

mically amiss but "congested districts," and a "surplus population." And what has been their remedy for it all? Emigration. Having as landlords "cleared" the people off their estates, as philanthropists they would clear them out of the country. Their system of economics has been as simple as their Christianity. But I have not yet sounded the depths of their economics. During and after the famine times, not only the people who remained at home, but also those who emigrated helped to provide their rents. According to Lord Dufferin,* the Irish emigrants in America sent to their friends at home £13,000,000, within the span of sixteen years, from 1848 to 1864; and most of it was consumed in rents. Thus America, as well as Ireland, was laid under contribution for rent, which was as usual spent mostly in England, or everywhere and anywhere except at home. But I had nearly forgotten that they have proved their sympathy for the people; they did interest themselves once in improving their condition. During the famine years, having absorbed their rents, they appealed to England and to the beneficent of every clime to extend a helping hand towards the starving people. Even the *Times* could not endure it.† It upbraided them as "a confederacy of rich proprietors craving employment for the poor which they are themselves bound to provide by every sense of duty to a land from which they derive their incomes. It is too bad that the Irish landlord should come to ask charity of the English and Scotch mechanic; but it seems that those who forget all duties forget all shame. The Irish rent must be paid twice over." On February 25th, 1847, it returned to the assault. In Ireland, it said, "Property ruled with a savage and tyrannical sway. It exercised its rights with

* *Irish Emigration and Tenure of Land in Ireland*, page 3.
† On September 22nd, 1846.

a hand of iron, and renounced its duties with a front of brass." In 1852 it said that "the name of an Irish landlord stinks in the nostrils of Christendom." It would not be correct to infer that all deserved such a whipping as that. There were some, unfortunately not many, amongst the old race of landlords who, considering the traditions into which they were born, did act on the principle that property has its duties as well as its rights; and they deserve great honour for having risen so high above their surroundings. But I am dealing with them as a class, who might and ought to have done a great deal for the country, and who did very much less than nothing.

Let us now see what Trinity College has, as landlord, done for the country. It has estates in seventeen counties; over 200,000 acres in all. It is immediate landlord of 14,404 acres in Kerry, Queen's County, Wicklow, and Louth, besides being head landlord of large estates in the other counties. As a specimen of its action in the other counties I take its action in Kerry. It is direct landlord over 10,341 acres around Caherciveen, a part of the confiscated estates of The McCarthy More. The O'Connell family used to be middlemen under it till about forty years ago, and about 80 years ago they transformed Caherciveen from a mere row of huts into the beginning of a prosperous town. They gave sites for houses at small rents, built schools, and helped it to become a thriving place. With its beautiful position, behind it the Iveragh mountains, before it the expanse of Dingle Bay, and placed directly on the way of the tourist, Trinity College, with its enormous wealth, might have done a great deal for it, and it has done less than nothing. The only progress which can be laid to the credit of its landlord is progress of rent. It takes a large revenue from this town made by the O'Connells and improved by the people. Allowing it that unearned increment to

which it is at least by law entitled, it has not the "economic sense" to see that it would be a profitable investment to spend money on the improvement of the place. There have been schools there under the charge of the Presentation Nuns since the days of O'Connell. The children who attend those schools are the children of the tenants of Trinity College. One would expect that an Educational Institution, and the richest College in Europe, would patronize at least the educational interests of its tenants. Well, the Nuns needed to enlarge their schools some time ago. They bought a plot on which to build, and our wealthy model of educational progress charges them £10 a year rent for it. The Manager, in their behalf, set before Dr. Traill who was then Bursar and is now Provost, of their landlord, the purpose for which the plot was taken, but the reply was a peremptory claim for rent. In the town there is also a Protestant school, attended by a few Protestant children. That school has, I believe, neither rent nor rates to pay; the "non-sectarian" landlord does all. Its conduct towards the country part of its estate is as bad. It extracts the highest rents it can screw out of wastes of moorland and water, and even a wretched row of wayside huts called the village of Doory, which a village moneylender would be almost ashamed to own, contribute their mite towards educating the students of Trinity. And how do those poor tenants make the rent? They find most of it in the sea beside them, and in America beyond it. The fish they catch and the American letter they get supply the rent. Some bog freedom which they once enjoyed helped them also, for they used to sell whatever turf they cut over and above their needs. But our versatile University has turned bog-ranger, and allows that turbary no more. Its dealing through all its estates is of the same kind.

I am aware that its rents are apparently very low. But

the consequent loss to the College brings no gain to its tenants. Only the Provost and Senior Fellows gain by the transaction. Its estates were rented out at short leases, and at every renewal of lease a fine had to be paid. About half a century ago, the law sanctioned the practice of the Provost and Senior Fellows to appropriate the fines, the rents to be devoted to the educational interests of the College. The "economic sense" of the College Governors felt the advantage—not to education, but to themselves—of a system of low rents and high fines. It was all the same to the tenants, but it was not all the same to the Provost and Fellows. The tenants would have to pay in some form; hence they lost nothing, whilst the Provost and Senior Fellows gained a good deal. The College was made the victim, and education became the scape-goat. Thus it happens that, notwithstanding the enormous wealth of Trinity College, it lags far behind in the educational progress of the day.* Its revenues which, like food, should pass to and be assimilated by every part of the body, are prevented by a cancer and are in great part consumed in one spot. Thus it happens that, whilst according to its revenues it should be the best, it is in reality one of the worst, equipped Universities in the world. Thus it happens that, with all its wealth, it is a-begging for subsidies; that it has so far failed to fulfil the condition on which Lord Iveagh has offered a subsidy; that the curriculum of its Medical Faculty has been condemned by the Medical authorities. These, however, are incidental to my present argument. What I want to point out is that, like the other landowners as a class, it has given no return to the country for all it has consumed of its substance. It cannot afford to give the country even a first-rate school of science and technics.

*Cfr. an article by Prof. Mahaffy in proof thereof, in *The Contemporary Review* for January, 1882; also a Report drawn up by the late Prof. Fitzgerald in the early part of 1899.

CHAPTER XVII.

WHAT THE PROTESTANT CHURCH HAS GOT IN IRELAND, AND WHAT IT HAS GIVEN OR DONE IN RETURN.

THE Catholics were prostrate. Slavery, and the dread of more of it, had become their normal condition. They had inherited oppression, and had almost come to be satisfied with it provided they were allowed to hug their chains in peace. They lived and acted, or rather suffered, as though they were a people without rights, whom nature had ordained to be outlaws and strangers in the land of their fathers. But courage to resist the exaction of tithes came to them from a combination of causes. The first moving power was their poverty, and their inability to pay. Then there was the sense of injustice which they felt in having to pay for a creed which slavery and chains had failed to make them accept, and there was the sense of cruelty which they felt in being driven to leave their children without bread in order to pay an impost which the law had privileged with a first claim on the fruits of their labour. Then came the New Reformation Society in 1824. Those "New Lights," as they were called, made the people feel as they had never felt before that in paying tithes they were paying the parsons to insult them. The Rev. Mr. Blakeley declared before a Select Committee in 1832 that those Scripture Missioners were inspired more by political rancour than by religious zeal; and, according to the evidence of Mr. Montgomery, the people "knew little of the Protestant Epis-

copalian parson, except in the character of tithe-proctor." Then, the intrepidity of O'Connell gave them hope, his eloquence roused them from their lethargy, and the winning of Catholic Emancipation made them feel their power. With O'Connell was associated Dr. Doyle, who wrote these words, the last of which became a kind of war-cry:—"There are many noble traits in the Irish character, mixed with failings which have always raised obstacles to their own well-being; but an innate love of justice, and an indomitable hatred of oppresson, is like a gem upon the front of our nation which no darkness can obscure. To this fine quality I trace their hatred of tithes; may it be as lasting as their love of justice!"* Finally, the people were exasperated into fight by the action of Rev. Mr. McDonald, who, whilst supplying for the Protestant rector of Graigue, a man who had lived in harmony with his Catholic neighbours, not only collected the tithes with a provoking imperiousness, but demanded them also from the parish priest and had his horse destrained for the debt. That was in 1830. They felt the collection of tithes from themselves to be an injury which they should no longer bear; they felt it was adding insult to injury to collect them from their parish priest, and the super-added insult stung them to vengeance. The tithe-war was begun. It rapidly spread over Carlow, Kilkenny, Tipperary, Cork, Limerick, and over all the South. The police and the soldiers who were called on to assist in collecting the tithes, came in conflict with the people at Newtownbarry, Thurles, Castlepollard, Carrickshock, Wallstown, Rathkeeran, Carrigtwohill, Kilmurry, Mullinahone, Palleskenry, Castlemahon, and Rathcormac; and blood was shed, and lives were lost in each encounter. Grattan said in Parliament years

* Letter to Thomas Spring Rice, Esq., M.P. (afterwards, Lord Monteagle); page 121.

before:—"The most sanguinary laws in your Statute Book are the tithe-bills; the Whiteboy Act is a tithe-bill; the Riot Act is a tithe-bill." In fact, to the exactions of the tithe-proctor are to be traced the Whiteboys, the Whitefeet, and other societies of those days whose members injustice and oppression had driven into a guerilla warfare because the law which they were asked to respect had outlawed them from all constitutional action to recover their civil rights.

Mr. Stanley, the Irish Chief Secretary, said that "the people must be made to respect the law." In 1832, Parliament meanwhile gave a grant of £60,000 to the parsons to recoup them for the tithes they were unable to collect, and the Government undertook the work of collecting them to recoup itself. "The Lord Lieutenant." as O'Connell said, "was made tithe-proctor general of Ireland." Between the cost of lawyers, soldiers, police, and proclamations, they spent about £60,000 more on the work, but they succeeded in collecting only £12,000. In 1833, the arrears went up to £1,200,000, in place of which, £1,000,000 more of public money was granted by Parliament to the parsons. Instead of making the people to respect the law, the law was made to respect the people, or rather the justice of their cause; and the Tithe Composition Act was passed in 1834. That Act did not take the burden of the tithes from the people. It altered them into a fixed average quantity instead of letting them vary in amount with the industry of the husbandman and the value of his produce. It made no change in the burden of the tithes, but only in the method of collecting them. The tithe was still to be collected, no longer however by taking away the tenth of the actual harvest, but the composition estimate of the tithes, taking their average value for a series of years. The Catholics still persisted in protesting against being made to pay for insulting their faith.

They refused to respect a law which was made to disrespect them; and finally, in 1838, a tithe rent-charge was substituted by Parliament for tithes collected from the people.

It is to be observed here also that the tithe burden still remained; only the manner of payment was again changed. The landlord was for the future to pay the tithe to the parson, and he was to recoup himself by raising the rent on the tenant. In other words, the landlord became tithe-proctor, for which the law allowed him 25 per cent. commission on the collection. The parson got only three-fourths of what he used to claim; but he had the benefit of getting his tithe without trouble, and with security. The landlord was well paid by the extravagant commission which he received. The one who still had to bear the burden was the Catholic, on whom the rent was raised as a set-off against the tithe rent-charge which the landlord paid the parson. The parsons still got their tithes; the Catholics still paid for them; and the landlords gained over £125,000 a year by the transaction. As the spokesmen of the Protestant interest have been insisting that, not Catholics, but the Protestants themselves, have been paying for its maintenance, I think it well to quote the following from a pamphlet published in 1867, by Dr. O'Brien, the Protestant Bishop of Ossory:—"The tithe rent-charge is paid by the proprietor to the parish clergyman, not as a voluntary contribution to his maintenance, nor as an impost laid on him for that purpose by the State; it is a consideration for the tithes, which were the property of the Church, but were transferred to the landlord, and are enjoyed by him . . . . the fraction of the rights of the Church which the Tithe Composition represented, was ascertained and secured by the law to the Church. And one-fourth of the amount of this composition was allowed to

the landlord for receiving the whole from his tenants, and paying over three-fourths to the clergyman. So that, for every £75 that he pays in rent-charge, he has received £100. This is the only sense in which the revenues of the Irish Church are extracted from the landlord."* I have other Protestant witnesses to the same interpretation of the tithe rent-charge; but I have selected Dr. O'Brien, because he was in his day one of the ablest and one of the most uncompromising champions of Protestant ascendancy in Ireland. Having given his words, I let its present champions settle the matter with him, and with writers of authority like Dr. Maziere Brady. But, that the burden of the tithes was not taken from the people is evident from the Tithe Commutation Act itself. It allowed the landlords 25 per cent. commission. Commission on what? Not, certainly, on voluntary offerings of their own; and yet it was a commission on something. It was a commission on the tithes which they were to collect from the people under the new name of rent. We are thus enabled to set its proper value on what Bishop Chadwick wrote some months ago in the course of the usual anti-Catholic cry:—"We never ask anything from the people," he said, with that unblushing coolness which seems to be one of the *charismata* of the "simpler Christianity" in Ireland. To which the *Freeman's Journal* promptly replied:—"No; you have long since taken all." We are also enabled to think of with the right idea, although one may not call by its right name, the expression which Bishop O'Hara, at his Synod in Waterford within the past few weeks applied to a plain and unquestionable statement of facts as to the Catholic source of Protestant

* *The Case of the Established Church in Ireland*, by James Thomas O'Brien, D.D., page 32. See also *The English State Church in Ireland*, published in 1869, by Wm. Maziere Brady, D.D., Vicar of Donoughpatrick, and Chaplain to four Lord Lieutenants; page 21, *et passim*.

Church revenues, embodied in their Maynooth Resolutions by the Bishops of Ireland last summer. The Resolution was as follows:—"That, whereas in addition to their endowments for higher and intermediate education and the great wealth of their Church, amounting to a capital of £8,000,000, derived originally from the appropriation of Catholic Church property, etc." Having recalled that statement, Dr. O'Hara said:—"Now, that is a lie." One thing is true at any rate, that this Protestant bishop of four dioceses is consistent with himself. When the Protestant Church was disestablished in 1869, another change was made in the mode of providing it with revenue. The revenue was again secured for it by Commutation. That is what its apologists love to call "disendowment." It is a consoling ambition to bear the name of martyr, as long as one has not to bear the reality of martyrdom. They would keep the cash in their pockets, and at the same time retain the grievance of having been "disendowed." I have traced the identity of the source of their Church endowment to the Catholic spoliation of the past and to the tithe imposts of 300 years down to our own day. For my present purpose, however, I am not much interested in the arrangements made at the time of the disestablishment. My purpose is to set forth the resources of Protestantism in the past, and to ask what it has done for the people in return. But before I make a statement of these resources, it is well to consider for how many were those resources provided. At the time of the tithe-war there were 6,427,712 Catholics in Ireland, and only 852,064 Episcopalian Protestants. In 1861, there were 4,505,265 Catholics, and only 693,357 Protestants. But of these there were 417,011 in the two Protestant dioceses in Ulster, leaving only 276,346 Protestants in the rest of Ireland. There were in 1861, only 80,860 Protestants in Munster; that is, nearly

6,000 less than the population of Cork. There were only 40,000 in Connaught; that is, less than the population of Limerick. At present there are 3,308,661 Catholics, and only 581,089 Episcopalian Protestants in Ireland, notwithstanding the emigration of the Catholics on the one hand, and the enormous amount of money which has been spent to gain converts for love or money, or for culinary considerations, over to Protestantism. But in the rest of Ireland outside Ulster there are 2,609,459 Catholics, and only 220,716 Episcopalian Protestants; that is nearly 12 to 1. Even in Ulster, the Episcopalian Protestants are just a little more than half the Catholics of Ulster, and the Presbyterians about three-fifths. In the rest of Ireland outside Ulster there are only 17,750 Presyterians; of other Protestant sects, there are 56,703 in Ireland, but in the rest of Ireland outside Ulster, only 9,845.

As I am dealing with population, I may as well, once for all, get rid of a pharisaical scandal which our critics take from what they call the awful army of priests in Ireland. There are 3,542 priests in Ireland, for 3,301,661 Catholics; that is, 1 for every 934. If I deducts priests disabled from work by illness or old age, there would remain about one for every 1,000 Catholics. And if we deduct members of Religious Orders and priests engaged in teaching, there remain 2,714; that is 1 for every 1,206. Now, let me first compare that with the Catholic Church in Great Britain. There are in England and Scotland 3,711 priests for 2,014,000 Catholics; that is 1 for every 542. As is the case in Ireland, many of these are engaged in teaching; but on the other hand, nearly every Religious Community in Great Britain has charge of a parish or mission; in Ireland, members of Religious Orders have no parochial duties. I do not make this comparison for the purpose of showing

that there are more priests in Great Britain than are necessary; I think that there should be more priests than are available for missionary work there. I make the comparison to recall the curious fact that we never hear the cry about the awful army of priests in Great Britain, although the priests are more numerous, and the Catholics, as a body, are poorer there than in Ireland. But why do our critics of "the economic sense" turn their microscope especially on Ireland? I take the cause to be that they can no longer hide the economic desolation which they themselves have made, and they want to throw the blame of Ireland's poverty on anything or on anyone to shield themselves from public scorn. It is a paradox in human nature, yet it is proverbial, that one is hated by the man who harms him. The very presence of the injured one is a living rebuke to him, and one does not like a rebuke. If the victim not only lives but thrives, his success reminds the wrong-doer that his injustice has been in vain, and he is angry that the victim succeeds.

> Forgiveness to the injured doth belong,
> But they never pardon who have done the wrong.*

It is in Ireland they have made the ruin, and, of course, they do not like to be held accountable, or to have it thrown in their face—Hence Romanism has caused it all! It is the Romish priests, monks and nuns, the Romish religion, that have desolated the land!

Now, considering the cry they raise about the army of priests in Ireland, one would be inclined to think that there are only a few scattered parsons to be found in the country. But what do I find? According to the *Irish Church Directory*, there were 1,724 parsons in Ire-

* Dryden—*Conquest of Granada.* Cf. *Hoc habent pessimum animi magnâ fortunâ insolentes; quos laeserunt et oderunt.* Seneca—*De Ira,* II. 33.

land in 1903, for 581,089 Protestants; that is, 1 for every 331. Hence, setting aside all consideration as to hearing confessions and various other duties of the Catholic Church which require proportionately many more priests than parsons, if the priests in Ireland were proportionate to the actual number of parsons, they should be about 10,000 in all, and if the parsons were in proportion to the actual number of priests they should be only about 600 in all. But they are 1,724; and if we suppose that 1,000 of them are married, and that each has a family of about five, we have in all about 6,000 inhabitants of the episcopal palaces and of the glebe houses of Ireland. There are 800 Presbyterian ministers for 443,276 Presbyterians; that is 1 for every 554; there are 250 Methodist ministers for 62,000 Methodists; that is, 1 for every 248. Let us set down 250 more ministers for other Protestant sects. And if we count in the families of the married ministers and add them to those of the bishops and parsons, we arrive at a grand total of about 11,000, out of the 1,086,371 Protestants of all sorts in the country. I do not compute those statistics to complain of the revelation they make. Why should I complain? Protestants might very reasonably remind me that it is none of my business. To be sure, they constantly and offensively complain so of Catholics. But then it is one of the many privileges into which they have been born, a monopoly prescribed by long tradition and by constant use, to denounce or to defame any Catholic person or practice they dislike, and the further protective privilege to taunt us with stirring up sectarian strife should any of us dare to strike back in defending ourselves. Neither have I made the calculation for the purpose of making our critics appear ridiculous, although I see that, of course, it will have that effect. I am merely discussing the question.

According to Dr. Maziere Brady, writing in 1867,* out of the 2,428 parishes in Ireland there were 199, covering an area of 557,000 acres, in which there was not a single Protestant. Yet revenue to the amount of £13,400 a year went out of that district to non-resident Incumbents for their labours in saving souls that did not exist there. The old churches which had been taken from the Catholics were let go to ruin, and may be seen to this day standing in lonely desolation in the midst of country grave-yards. Sometimes that disgrace is disguised by uniting several parishes into one benefice, and by placing the whole in charge of one Incumbent. According to Dr. Brady there were, out of the 1,570 benefices in Ireland, 107 covering an area of 626,000 acres and yielding a revenue of £20,000 a year, in each of which there were only an average of two or three families, including the family of the parson and the sexton. According to Godkin,† in 1834 there were 456 parishes, each of which had a Protestant population of from 1 to 20; that is, only a few families at most, always, of course, including the families of the parson and the sexton. And the number of such parishes had increased to 575 in 1861. In 1834, there were 382 parishes, in which the Protestants varied from 20 to 50; and the number of such parishes had increased to 416 in 1861. In 1834, there were 307 parishes, in which the Protestants varied from 5 to 10; and the number of such parishes had increased to 349 in 1861. According to the Report of the Commissioners of Public Instruction, issued in 1834, there were 157 parishes in which the parson was non-resident, and in which there was no Divine Service. In 1849, George Henry Moore stated in Parliament that he paid tithes in eight parishes, and that in all there

* *The English State Church in Ireland;* page 158 and *seq.*
† *Ireland and her Churches.*

was neither Protestant church nor glebe, nor a resident parson, nor a single Protestant as far as he knew. Not without reason, therefore, did Lord Lytton say in 1835: "They talk of Irish bulls; but the words *Irish Church* was the greatest bull in the language. It was called the 'Irish Church' because it was a church not for the Irish." About the same time Sydney Smith wrote of the anomaly of Irish Protestantism:—"I have always compared the Protestant Church in Ireland (and I believe my friend Tom Moore stole the simile from me) to the institution of butchers' shops in all the villages of our Indian Empire. We *will* have a butcher's shop in every village, and you Hindoos shall pay for it. We know that many of you do not eat meat at all, and that the sight of beef-steaks is particularly offensive to you; but still a stray European may pass through your village, and want a steak or a chop; the shop *shall* be established, and you shall pay for it? There is no abuse like it in all Europe, in all Asia, in all the discovered parts of Africa, and in all we have heard of Timbuctoo. It is an error that requires 20,000 armed men for its protection in time of peace; which costs more than £1,000,000 a year."*

Let us now consider a few of the dioceses. I will take those in charge of Dr. Bunbury and Dr. O'Hara, who have made themselves specially notorious in reviving current polemics. Dr. Bunbury is bishop of three dioceses: Limerick, Ardfert, and Aghadoe. According to returns given before the disestablishment, there were 15,103 Protestants in the three dioceses; that is, about 5,000 less than the number of Catholics at present in the parish where I live, even after the emigration drain of 36 years. There were 188 parishes, which would leave an average of 15 or 16 families in each,

* *Works*, Vol. III., page 500

including the family of the parson and the sexton. Of those, 22 parishes had no Protestant; and 68 parishes had an average of 5·3 Protestant individuals. Dr. O'Hara has four dioceses: Cashel, Emly, Waterford and Lismore. At the time of the disestablishment there were 13,853 Protestants in the four dioceses, including civil, military, and other officials. There were 261 parishes, in 40 of which there was no Protestant, and in 65 of which the number of Protestants varied from one to ten. There were only 94 churches, the rest having been let go to ruin in the course of time. Some of the Catholic parishes within the same area contained each more Catholics than all the Protestants of these four dioceses taken together. Yet there were one Protestant Bishop, four Deans, four Archdeacons, four Precentors, four Chancellors, four Treasurers, Rural Deans, Choral Vicars, in all 152 clergymen to look after souls of the 13,853; that is, a parson for every 91 Protestants. If I went through all the Protestant dioceses of the country I should have a similar tale to tell.

Having to face such facts, and such a state of things as I have thus briefly exposed, Lord Macauley once said in Parliament—"Two hundred and eighty-five years has this Church been at work. What could have been done in the way of authority, privileges, endowments, which has not been done? . . . . Did any other set of bishops and clergy in the world ever receive half as much for doing twice as much? And what have we to show for all this lavish expenditure? What but the most zealous Catholic population on the face of the earth! Where you were a hundred years ago, where you were two hundred years ago, there you are still, not victorious over the domain of the old faith, but painfully and with dubious success defending your own frontier."

Now, what were the resources by which the Ecclesias-

tical machinery was kept going, which ministered to nobody in 199 parishes, to the family of the parson and the sexton in many others, and to only a few families in more than a thousand parishes? The following is a return of the Bishops' landed estates made to Parliament by the bishops themselves, and published on 11th February, 1824:—*

	ACRES.
The Archbishop of Armagh ...	63,470
,, Dublin	28,781
,, Tuam and Ardagh ...	49,281
,, Cashel and Emly ...	13,372
The Bishop of Meath	18,374
,, Clogher	32,817
,, Kilmore	51,350
,, Derry	94,836
,, Ossory	13,391
,, Ferns and Leighlin ...	11,697
,, Limerick, Ardfert and Aghadoe	6,720
,, Waterford and Lismore ...	8,500
,, Cork and Ross ...	22,755
,, Cloyne	15,871
,, Killaloe and Kilfenora ...	11,081
,, Elphin	31,017

Those 16 bishops who sent in returns had 473,313 acres of See lands.

No returns are given for the other six dioceses; but according to Parliamentary Reports 1831-1833, the See lands of the 22 bishops were ... 669,277 acres.
But besides the See lands they had demesne lands estimated at ... 5,500 acres.

Thus the total landed property of the bishops alone was 674,777 acres.

*I have compiled these from "*Ireland and her Churches*," by James Godkin. Pp. 96, 97, and 141; and from the *History of Tithes*," by John D'Alton, Esq., B.L., M.R.I.A. P. 50.

According to a letter* which appeared in *The Times* of January 29th, 1866, from the Rev. Dr. Alfred Lee, in reply to one from the late Aubrey de Vere, "the whole of the glebe lands now in possession of the beneficed clergy of Ireland amount to 132,756 statute acres, *no very considerable quantity* when compared with the area of Ireland." The Deans and Chapters had, at the lowest estimate, 500,000 acres. The grand total of all would be 1,307,533 acres. Baron Foster estimated the average value of the See lands at £1 an acre, and taking the other Church lands at the same value, we find that the revenue derivable from *its landed property alone* by the "Church of Ireland," that is, the Church of a small fraction of the population, would be £1,307,533. The reader is not to understand that the bishops actually received in rents £674,777 a year from those to whom their 674,777 acres of See lands were leased. According to the bishops themselves, their revenue from their lands was only £140,704 7s. a year; according to a statement made in Parliament by Grattan, it was £250,000 a year. But taking either of these estimates, why did the bishops not draw from their lands all the income which their lands were worth? They received much more than appears from the rental, because they let their lands on the Trinity College system; that is, at a low rental which made a show of general leniency, at heavy fines which retained the reality of revenue, and on short leases which secured a renewal of those fines almost as regularly as rent. Moreover, they let many of their lands to relatives in whose favour they might fore-

*By the Rev. Alfred T. Lee, M.A., LL.D., Rector of Ahoghill, and Rural Dean, and Hon. Sec. to the Church Institution for the Province of Armagh. I have italicised the words "no very considerable quantity." The letter was published as a pamphlet afterwards, from which I quote, at page 4—*The Ecclesiastical Settlement of Ireland.*

go the fines, and according to Read* some of them let lands on trust for their own benefit. The residue between the rental and the value of those lands did not go to further the interests of the Protestant Church; the Papists were made to pay for that, as we shall presently see.

The revenue was retained in the family, or at all events was not diffused beyond the limited circle of the Protestant interest, either to the economic interest of the people at large, or to the spiritual interest of the Protestants themselves.

That is how the difference between the value of the bishops' lands and their rental went, whilst they were getting public money from Government and were exacting cesses from the Catholic cottiers of the country to build their churches, or to repair those which the Catholics had built and had once used, but which had passed into the possession of Protestantism by the right of plunder. I will return to this presently. Their "simpler Christianity" showed its "economic sense" against the interests of that Christianity itself. Bishops and parsons had to pay out of their bishoprics and benefices an impost called First Fruits, that is, one year's revenue which was administered by the Board of First Fruits for general Church purposes ever since that impost was transferred from the coffers of the Sovereign to the treasury of the Church in the reign of Queen Anne.† That taxation of First Fruits was fixed according to the value of the See lands and the glebe lands in the time of Henry VIII., and was payable ever afterwards in the same unchanged ratio of a remote and low valuation. On the other hand, the tithes which the

* On *Simony*, page 137, cited by J. D'Alton, Esq., in his *History of Tithes*, page 54.

† Blackstone's *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, vol. 1., page 284.

poor Catholic had to pay for the work of the Protestant Church increased according to the increasing value of the land, to the increased produce of his tillage improved by the labour of his hands. Thus, the Archbishop of Armagh paid First Fruits on £400 a year, the ancient value of his See lands when they were in the hands of Catholics, instead of on £15,080 15s. 0d., the actual income which he got from his See lands according to his own return. The Bishop of Derry paid First Fruits on £250, the ancient value, instead of on £10,000, his actual yearly income from his lands. The Bishop of Ossory paid on £50, the ancient value, instead of on £3,000, his actual yearly income from his lands. The Bishop of Cloyne paid on £10 10s. 0d., the ancient value, instead of on £2,000, his actual yearly income from his lands. And so on. In this, as in every phase of the question, "heads I win, tails you lose," was the fundamental economic principle which in its dealing with Catholic Ireland the "Simpler Christianity" never failed to apply.

Besides the See lands, the bishops held 5,500 acres of demesne lands, which brought them an income of £10,295 13s. 0d. a year, according to their own return. The Estates of the Deans and Chapters brought an income of £130,000 a year. The glebe lands brought an income of £150,000 a year. The tithes (excluding those payable to laymen) brought an income of £590,450 a year. Then there was the Ministers' money, which brought an income of £25,000 a year. As that impost was abolished in 1857, and is now forgotten, I may explain that it was a house tax levied in corporate towns. It was the *peculium* of the parson, and went to supplement the revenue he received from the glebe lands and the tithes. The reader will get an idea of the share of that impost which

Catholics had to pay from the fact that such Catholic towns as Clonmel paid £341 a year, Cork paid £3,324, and Dublin paid £9,868, towards the Ministers' Money in 1853. According to the *Black Book*, quoted by D'Alton, they derived an income of £25,000 a year from *Church Fees*, that is, from burials and other such offices. Any monies paid by Protestants for their own Church could not of course be considered a grievance, and was never made a ground of complaint by Irish Catholics. But in former times the faithful were buried beside the parish church; hence a burial ground is called a churchyard. Mass was always offered up in the Church for the dead person, the corpse being present, and the funeral rites were afterwards completed by the priest at the grave outside. The churchyards were taken over with the churches for the use and profit of the "simpler" and more economic Christianity. Nevertheless, the Catholics continued to lay the remains of their dead in the graves of their fathers. They had to pay burial fees to the parson, but the priest was not allowed to perform the Catholic funeral rites at the grave side any more. That was one of the grievances to correct which "The Irish Catholic Association" was started by O'Connell in 1823. He said at one of their meetings, on November 3rd 1823, at the house of Mr. Coyne, the Catholic bookseller, in Capel Street—"They were not content with oppressing Catholics when living, but they must insult them when dead. . . . He heard it gravely asserted that the churchyard was the parson's freehold, and he could do as he pleased with it. And so he always understood that a man could make what use he pleased of his own freehold. But he had yet to learn whether a parson could plough up the burying-ground and sow turnips in it; and yet he was told it was his freehold. If he could appropriate the ground to sowing turnips or other vegetables, yet he doubted whether

such an occupation would be as productive as sowing Papists, for the 'freehold' of St. James', he was informed, produced the minister near a couple of thousand a year." O'Connell's memory was fresh of what had happened a few weeks before, when Father Blake, a Dublin parish priest, afterwards Bishop of Dromore, was prevented by the Protestant sexton from reciting the burial rites over the remains of Mr. Darcy, in St. Kevin's churchyard; although the family of the deceased was not prevented, rather compelled, to pay the parson £10 for burial fees, in other words, for the privilege of having their dead father insulted. A similar case occurred on the occasion of the burial of a nun in Tipperary within the memory of persons still living, and not very many years ago. The paupers of the Limerick workhouse used to be buried in St. Patrick's churchyard, which legally was under the jurisdiction of the Rector of the parish. In 1847, disease and want so raised their death-rate that burials in St. Patrick's soon increased considerably, whereupon the parson appeared before the Guardians and raised his burial fees to two shillings each.*

Putting aside pensions, proxies, symbols, and refections, not considering the fines raised on leased lands, or the family interests secured by the residue between the value and the actual rental of See lands, and after the loss to Church purposes of lands which were from time to time legally sneaked into and retained in bishops' families, the actual revenues used up by the machinery of the "Simpler Christianity" in Ireland to take 693,357 souls to heaven amounted each year to about £1,500,000.

Let us bear in mind that this immense revenue was made up from the alienated property of the Catholic Church and from the confiscated lands of

* See the *Limerick Reporter*, April, 1847.

Catholic families. But that portion which belonged to the Catholic Church had certain burdens to bear. Out of it churches and schools had to be kept up, the destitute poor had to be provided for, and the children of the poor had to be educated. Did those who succeeded to the booty succeed to the burden? It was all absorbed, yet the children were left untaught unless on the condition of proselytism, the poor were left unprovided for, even the appropriated churches were left unrepaired, and those that fell into ruin were left in ruins, as every churchyard over the country exhibits them at present in the grey loneliness of their decay. All disappeared year by year, and the public treasury was appealed to for help, and the already despoiled Catholics were compelled to contribute to the repair of old churches or to the building of new ones, for the spiritual luxury of congregations consisting in hundreds of cases of only the parson's clerk. From 1800 to 1826, according to Godkin, Parliament granted them for church-building £224,946; for glebes, £61,484; for glebe houses £144,734. Within the same period, Parliament gave them loans for church-building to the amount of £286,572; and for glebe houses, £222,291. That is to say £431,164 in gift, and £508,863 on loan. Thus, as gift and loan together, they who had so much already received from the public treasury during the first quarter of the 19th century nearly £1,000,000 more.* Again he writes, on the authority of Parliamentary returns, that from the time of the Union to 1844, the Protestant Church in Ireland received from the public treasury for building churches, £525,371; for building glebe houses, £336,889; for

* Godkin: *Ireland and her Churches:* Introduction, p. xviii. Godkin observes that the Protestant Church in Ireland which absorbed so much money from so many sources, had 286 cures with a non-resident parson; this he says on the authority of the *Liber munerum publicorum Hiberniæ,* Vol. II., pp. 208; 226.

Protestant Charity Schools, £1,105,588; for the Society for discountenancing vice, etc., £101,991; for the Kildare Street Society Schools, £170,502; that is to say, leaving out one set of the elements common to both these statistics, the Protestant Church in Ireland received Parliamentary grants from 1800 to 1844 to the enormous amount of £2,301,725; to which if the loan of £508,863 be added, we have a grand total of £2,810,588. And if there were any Parliamentary loans from 1826 to 1844, as was probably the case, the sum of Parliamentary favour should be expressed in cash to the amount of £3,000,000.* During the sixty years preceding 1833, from Parliament, church rates and parish cess, the Protestant Church in Ireland received £1,070,435 for the building of churches, and £809,699 for the building of glebe houses; only £170,000 came from private donations.† The church cess brought in £80,000 a year; and of this Catholics had to bear the burden almost entirely, although, as I have already explained, they had no voice in the Vestries which levied the cess. That cess was abolished by the Church Temporalities Act of 1834, which also reduced the number of Archbishops from four to two, and the number of Bishops from eighteen to ten, and ordered that the revenues of the suppressed Sees and some other benefices be—not used for the economic improvement of the country—but diffused over the Protestant Church itself. In the landed estates of fourteen dioceses alone, there were 144,775 acres of waste land, but easily reclaimable by labour. The economic condition of the country generally would be better for the reclamation; it would be a source of employment for the poor,

* Godkin, *loc. cit.*, page 96.

† Figures quoted by the late Aubrey de Vere in his *Church Setlement of Ireland, page* XIV., from a work called *The Irish Church, its History and Statistics.*

of whom, according to the Report of the Poor Inquiry Commissioners in 1836, no fewer than 585,000 were then out of work and destitute for thirty weeks of the year; nobody would suffer by it; and it would be a source of profit to the bishops themselves, besides the apostolic pleasure of doing good. But their lordships seemed to have no passion for that luxury, although they were the beacon lights of the economic Christianity in Ireland.

How then did their revenues disappear? "I have," writes Godkin,* with the kind permission of the Registrar, extracted from the Registry of the Court of Probate the amount of assets left by every bishop who died since 1822, with the exception of a few who were but a short time in their Sees. The assets are sworn to be under a certain sum on which duty is paid. But this sum does not include any real property the deceased may have purchased, nor any settlements he may have made on members of his family, nor any stock he may have transferred to avoid legacy duty, or possibly to avoid the fame of having died too rich for the bishop of a poor church." The following is what he found in the Probate Court:—

		£
Archbishops of Armagh ...	Beresford ...	70,000
	Stewart ...	25,000
,, Dublin ...	Magee ...	45,000
	Whately ...	40,000
,, Cashel ...	Broderick ...	80,000
	Lawrence ...	55,000
,, Tuam ...	French ...	73,846
	Plunkett ...	26,331
Bishops of Meath ...	Alexander ...	73,000
	O'Beirne ...	20,000
	Singer ...	25,000
	Stopford ...	14,000

* *Loc. cit.*, page XVIII.-XIX.

			£
Bishop of Clogher	...	Loftus	... 60,000
,, Raphoe	...	Bisset	... 46,000
,, Limerick	...	Griffin	... 45,000
,, Kilmore	...	Leslie	... 40,000
		Beresford	... 36,000
,, Killaloe	...	Butson	... 40,000
,, Derry	...	Knox	... 27,692
,, Cork	...	Kyle	... 20,000

On the 12th July, 1842, Mr. Grattan produced in Parliament another list taken also from the Probate Court; this list is of bishops who preceded those I have named:—

			£
Archbishop of Dublin	...	Fowler	... 150,000
,, Cashel	...	Agar	... 400,000
,, Tuam	...	Beresford	... 260,000
		Warburton	... 600,000
Bishop of Dromore	...	Percy	... 40,000
,, Cork	...	Stopford	... 25,000
,, Ferns	...	Cleaver	... 50,000
,, Limerick	...	Bernord	... 60,000
,, Killaloe	...	Knox	... 100,000
,, Clogher	...	Porter	... 250,000
,, Raphoe	...	Hawkins	... 260,000

Godkin writes in the work from which I have quoted* that the Protestants of Ireland in addition to their vast rental as landed proprietors, have for their younger sons, brothers, sons-in-law, and all their kinsmen and kinswomen who marry clergymen, those church lands and revenues which I have just set forth. And he continues:—"In addition to this we must note the fact, that there are many of those families of the Protestant nobility and gentry who were born in

* Pages 525, 526, 533.

the lap of the Church, and have derived their whole support, and all their rank and wealth from this most generous 'Nursing Mother.' The total number of bishops who ruled the Irish Church since its foundation by Queen Elizabeth, is 326; of these, 123, or more than one-third, were Englishmen, who came over as clerical adventurers or Viceroy's chaplains to seek their fortunes, and generally they found, especially since the Revolution, a mine of wealth with which many a poor family was made rich. I have taken the trouble of preparing a catalogue of all the bishops, English and Irish, who were enabled by their incomes from the Irish Establishment to found families, whose representatives are still in existence. From this it will be evident that a large portion of the Irish nobility and gentry have ecclesiastical blood flowing in their veins, and that the 7,000 Episcopal proprietors are a sort of Levitical tribe, far better endowed than any other priestly order ever was in the history of the world." He then gives a list of 127 Irish Protestant bishops who have founded families of wealth and power in Ireland; and he adds:—"We thus see that 127 bishops—a third of the whole number, realised estates and founded families, many of which have entered the ranks of the nobility. . . . There is scarcely one of our Protestant representatives that has not the blood of bishops or dignitaries flowing in his veins, and who does not instinctively cling to the Establishment as an appanage of his order."

I have now made a general review of the revenues received by Government, by the Protestants as landlords and public officials, and by the Protestant Church, from Ireland. They have had the power, the social influence, the patronage, and the wealth of the country. Sir Horace Plunkett tells us that they have the "civic virtues and efficiencies," of which he also tells us the

Catholics are bereft. Very well, then, they might have easily moved the economic forces of the country on towards material progress, and, as we are assured, they alone knew how to do it. Have they done it? Have they used those "strenuous qualities" which we are told they brought over with them across the Channel? Their public advantages, their unlimited power, and their indefinitely acquirable wealth, surely incurred some social responsibility. They surely had a duty towards the country whence their wealth and power came. How did they respond to that responsibility? How did they do that duty? Let it be learned, not from me, but from a pamphlet on the need of provision for the poor in Ireland, by Mr. Douglas, of Glasgow*:—

"In Ireland there is not only a fund provided by the law of nature and human feeling for preventing the starvation of the labourers in the midst of that plenty, which their own hands have produced by toil, unexampled in any other civilized country, and privations scarcely exceeded in the most savage tribes, *but there is a fund established by law* for the maintenance of the poor—in Ireland as well as England—by the laws of England, as they stood antecedent to the statutes of Elizabeth, which transferred from the Church lands the original burden of maintaining the poor under which the Church benefices were at first granted, and laid that burden on land generally.

"For the immense possessions of the Irish Catholic Church, were equally burdened with the maintenance of the poor, by the terms of the original grants—and by the uniform tenor and practice of that common law in England, which, by the right of conquest became the common law of Ireland. The statutes of the English Parliament, for relieving the Church lands and reve-

* Published by Longmans & Co. in 1828, and quoted by Dr. Doyle in his letter to Mr. Spring Rice, to which I have already referred.

nues, which had been resumed by Henry VIII., of the burden of maintaining the poor, under which Henry had effected the resumption, and for laying the expense of maintaining the poor on the whole land of England, were intended to tranquillize the minds of the new owners of the Church property in England. But these statutes never extended to Ireland, nor even to Scotland—till Scotland, by her own legislature, enacted a similar provision for the poor out of the land, in order to put down the 100,000 'maisterfu' reevers and sorners,' mentioned by Fletcher of Saltoun.

"In Ireland, therefore, the law regarding the maintenance of the poor, stands precisely where it did before the time of Henry VIII., when the Church was bound, from its revenue, to maintain the poor, and did so while the Catholic Church had these revenues. If therefore, the Episcopal Church of Ireland obtained and holds the princely revenue of the ancient Catholic Establishment, by what principle of common law, or common sense, does the successor in the property refuse to perform the duty inseparably attached to that property? It cannot be because the revenues are insufficient, or because the spiritual duties of the Irish Church are too severe for the remuneration. For it was ascertained that of the population of Ireland, when taken at 6,800,000 only 1-14th or 490,000 were Episcopalians, and 300,000 Dissenters; while nearly six millions were of the original religious establishment, to whom the property belonged, and among whom, from obvious causes, the great bulk of the poor are to be found. The Episcopal Church of Ireland contains, besides curates, who do the duty where there are churches, 687 sinecure dignified clergy in 1829 parishes, who may be said, with few exceptions, to be non-resident.

"The rental of Ireland has been rated at 20s. an acre,

including mountains and bogs; and the extent of the surface being, by some, taken at seventeen millions of acres; but let it be taken as low as fourteen millions, the total will be a rental of fourteen millions sterling. The proportion of the land composing Church Property, exclusive of tithes, has been estimated, by good authority, at two-elevenths of the whole, which is annually £2,545,454

The tithes of the 1,289 benefices are said scarcely, in any case, to be under £500 per annum, and, in many cases, £1,000 to £5,000; but say £550, which gives	£708,950
Total ...	£3,254,404

"But this shows the revenues of the Church at much too low an estimate; because the Church lands are generally situated in the most fertile districts, and they are let usually at the old low rent, not a fifth of the true value, because the incumbent receives a large fine, grassum, at the renewal of each lease, by which practice some dignitaries have amassed half a million of money. Five millions, therefore, would probably be nearer the truth than any other sum, as the annual revenue of the Irish Church; and this for doing the spiritual duty of 490,900 souls. Such enormous waste of public wealth, for such a purpose, is altogether without example in the history of human extravagance.

"Such a fund for the maintenance of the poor was, perhaps, never known in any age, and this, too, one of its primary purposes; and yet we are asked, where is the fund from which to maintain Irish poverty, and suppress Irish beggary—the opprobrium of the empire?

"It has often been proposed to commute the tithes, at a low valuation, which would undoubtedly tend to tranquillize the people whose feelings are constantly

exasperated by the harsh proceedings of tithe proctors in seizing their poor pittance of potatoes, or their pigs, for such an offensively levied impost, for the support of a Church of which they know nothing but by its practical oppressions, which, too, readily prepares them to think ill of the heretical principles, that can lead to such conduct in its ministers.

"But the commutation of tithes, if the remission were made to the landlord, would not do much for the tenant, except to increase his rent, although it would so far be of benefit, as the payment would not be so vexatiously taken in kind, or enforced by the oppressive and expensive process of ecclesiastical courts, where the clergy are judges in their own causes, and ecclesiastical officers reap the gain of the costs which ruin the tenantry.

"The commutation should be accomplished with a legislative declaration that the proper maintenance of the poor was originally a condition of granting the tithe, and that the price should be low in consequence of this burden being expressly retained and re-enacted in the law of commutation, as a perpetual payment from the land.

"A very small portion of the immense property in land belonging to the Church, after the death of the present incumbents, would suffice for the liberal endowment of a fair proportion of dignified clergy, both Episcopalian and Catholic.

"The great bulk of three millions a year, belonging in property to the Church, might form a fund for the most magnificent improvements, by employing, at adequate wages, the Irish poor in cutting canals, making roads, draining and cultivating bogs, and morasses; exploring coal, lime, marl, and other minerals; forming harbours; enclosing and planting on the Church lands; establishing fisheries, foundries, and various manu-

factures. By such means, the country might be indefinitely improved; and the demand for employment would raise the wages, the comforts, the character, the caution, the repugnance to reckless marriage, of the people; and retard the increase and improve the condition of the population.

"There is another fund for defraying the expense of providing for the Irish poor, which is but little thought of, though it is most important. Were Ireland conciliated by just government, by the impartial admission of all religions to civil and political privileges, by a just arrangement of Church property, so as to provide fairly for all the teachers of religion, without taking away anything which any man has a right to enjoy during his life, and were that abject poverty in the people abated, and their comforts improved, by a judicious system of relief, we should no longer see desperate hunger in arms against political and religious monopoly and oppression: the minister of peace leading on troops to shoot his starving flock, for rescuing or secreting the animal which yielded milk to their famishing children. We should see Ireland protected as Scotland is, by a few skeleton battalions, instead of a regular army, at an expense of two millions sterling—besides another army of local yeomanry and armed police—all of whom, besides the enormous expense, so far from producing peace, seem only more to embroil the fray, by local grudges and religious animosity, carrying arms only on one side.

"The pacification of Ireland, and above all the elevation of the character of the common people, would render the country safe and comfortable for the wealthy land-owners to reside in, and would induce persons of skill and capital to establish manufactures. In the present state of that unhappy country, it is difficult to blame absentees, who have the means of living in the tranquil portions of the empire."

But they let their opportunities go waste. As a body they thought only of themselves. They behaved as if *Ireland were they themselves,* as if they were everybody, and as if the Catholics of Ireland were nobody. It must be in that sense they say that they have always consulted for the interests of the country, inasmuch as what they did for themselves they did for Ireland; for they and the Ireland of their ideal are one. Does anyone think that I misrepresent their position? Then I let Chief Justice Whiteside state it. He spoke these words in Parliament as the avowed champion of Irish Protestant interests:—"Ignore two-thirds of those who follow any intellectual pursuit in Ireland; ignore five-sixths of the landed gentry, the greater portion of the aristocracy, forty-nine out of fifty of the manufacturers, and ignore also the skilled artisans, and then you have the nation." The people of Pagan Rome were not the Roman people whom the orators addressed in the *forum,* but their slaves. The *Populus Romanus* were few, but were everybody; the people of Rome were the multitude, but they were as though they were not. The men of Athens were not the Athenian men to whom the orators appealed, but the populace who did not count. I should be curious to learn from Sir Horace, or from anyone, how the language of Chief Justice Whiteside does not reveal the same pagan spirit. Yet, he spoke truly; in the sense that the wealth as well as the civil and military power of the country was in Protestant keeping. Not much more than half a century ago, a parson's son, when quite a little boy, was installed as Clerk of the Peace for a certain county in Ireland. He received the salary, or rather his father received it for him lest the official himself should spend it on sweets, and his Deputy did the work whilst he might be seen pegging a top or playing marbles about the Peace Office. As a body, Irish Protestants lived *in* Ireland, they lived *on*

Ireland, but they did not live *for* Ireland. As a body they lived for themselves alone. They lived out of the country as much as they could. They mis-spent their opportunity and their power to improve it. They had their day, and now that it is declining they would persuade the public, if they could, that its undeveloped condition is due to the uneconomic trend of our Catholic faith, and to the uneconomic character of our Catholic people whose energies they paralysed and whose hopes they blasted. It is a pity that Sir Horace has let himself be led into the choir to join their chorus, for through many notes he does not chant in harmony with them. The County Councils and other public bodies will have a busy time of it for many a day gathering together and putting in order the neglected economic elements of the country after the rigid narrowness, the creed and class selfishness, the incapacity or carelessness, and the mismanagement of generations.

CHAPTER XVIII.

OBJECT LESSONS IN TOLERANCE AND IN INTOLERANCE.

What I am now about to write will, I fear, be rather dry reading; but I hope it will be convincing. To me it is not pleasant writing; comparisons are always odious, but the unpleasant has sometimes to be faced. There shall be no rhetoric of mine in it, even if I had the gift of rhetorical expression. I will trust to the plainer but more powerful eloquence of facts. No person denies or questions now that down to recent years the non-Catholics in Ireland had a monopoly of power and official position. Lately, however, Catholics have been allowed to take some part in the public duties of the country; and because they have been claiming their due share, a cry has been raised that they are making for monopoly. It is a cry without a cause. They are accused of intolerant exclusiveness, not because they seek to lay hold of everything, but because they dare to aspire to anything. In a sense the cry is natural; the more so because it is habitual with those who raise it. They have been born into monopoly in Ireland, and they have come to think of it as the normal condition of affairs. According to their thoughts, and of course, according to their wishes, that is as it should be. They do not like to be disturbed from their traditional vantage ground—nobody in their circumstances would like it; and whoever undertakes to disturb them is held guilty of dislocating the civil elements of the country. It has always been so. Last night I read in

a book by J. P. Prendergast, the author of *The Cromwellian Settlement of Ireland,* that those who were intruded into the lands of the old Irish gentry used to complain of their laziness because they "coshered on the people" rather than consent to become labourers on the estates of those who had supplanted them; and Archbishop King likewise complained that the priests, when deprived of their homes, lived from house to house amongst the people, instead of deserting them or disappearing from the country* Whilst the fight for Emancipation was going on, it was objected that the Catholics had already got their meed of civil and religious rights, and that they could not, with safety to the constitution, be trusted with more. Fifty years ago the maxim was held against the Tenant League that "tenant right is landlord wrong." Less than forty years ago the cry was raised that Disestablishment was sacrilege and spoliation. A quarter of a century ago, Gladstone's land measures were denounced, as a denial of that sacred maxim of the fifties, a repudiation of the binding power of contracts, an injury to proprietary rights. The Local Government Bill, it was said, would let loose upon the country a popular power, without discipline or public conscience, which would daub or destroy everything it could control. Nevertheless, every event has one by one belied every prophecy. Whether the cry which is now raised be true or false we shall presently see.

Since Sir Antony M'Donnell, a distinguished public servant, was made Under Secretary at Dublin Castle, a continuous onslaught has been made on his official character. Those who keep up the cry can show nothing to justify it; but the head and front of his offending is that he is a Catholic who neither screens nor waters down his profession of faith, whilst many years of service have proved him worthy of every trust which the

* From the Settlement to the Revolution: pp. 63, 64.

Government has committed to his care. For which reason they are angry. They will never forgive him for being a trustworthy public servant, and, at the same time, uncompromising in the Catholic principles which he owns. If he were what a lady described to me a short time ago as an "*Irish Times* Catholic," he would happily fit into their arrangements, and they would cherish him as their own; if he were found wanting in his official duty they would have the consolation of raking it up in proof of the incapacity of Papists. He has disappointed them on either side; and that is the sin which shall never be forgiven him.

I will let Mr. T. W. Russell, M.P., say the rest, as he is neither a Catholic in faith nor a Nationalist in politics. In a speech made on October 6th, 1904, he is reported as follows*:—"He knew nothing of Sir Antony save what is known by the man in the street. He had two conversations with him on public business, not at all of a satisfactory character. But he protested in the strongest manner against the dead set which was being made against any man in the service of the State who is a Roman Catholic or a Nationalist. One day it is Mr. Gill, another day it is Sir Antony M'Donnell, and Colonel Saunderson had even attacked Mr. Finucane, one of the Estates Commissioners, whose real offence he suspected was that that gentleman is the son of a Limerick tenant farmer. The whole proceeding was unconstitutional and unfair. Who ever heard of an English Department being attacked in this way? . . . Last year Sir Antony M'Donnell personally superintended the formation of the new Land Purchase Department. For everything connected with it he was personally responsible, although, of course, final responsibility lay with the Lord Lieutenant. The clerical staff of that Department is recruited by the Civil Service Commissioners, and conse-

* In the *Irish Times*.

quently no question of religious partisanship can arise. Out of the three Estates Commissioners appointed under the Land Act by the Lord Lieutenant two were Protestants and one was a Roman Catholic. When Parliament rose in August last there were twenty-one inspectors employed by the Estates Commissioners at salaries of £800 a year each. Every one of these was a Protestant. What a splendid illustration that was of the alleged methods of the Catholic Association. Again, certain clerks in the Land Judge's Court were recently either dismissed, or about to be dismissed, owing to the sales in the Court having lessened the work. These men, temporary clerks, who had, however, been some fifteen years in the service, appealed to him, and he intervened on their behalf. Now, largely, he believed, owing to the action of Sir Antony M'Donnell, they had secured suitable and satisfactory employment. He knew nothing of their religion, but from their names he should say two were certainly Protestants, while the third might be a Roman Catholic. All these public actions must have had the sanction of the man traduced as 'a shameless partisan.' He (Mr. Russell) protested in the strongest manner against this effort to stir up religious rancour, whether it be done by Bishop or Parliamentarian, and all because an Asylum Board passes over a Protestant doctor for promotion in Co. Galway, and because a police tribunal found a case against a Protestant constable, the original and confirming authority in the case consisting of two Protestants and a Roman Catholic. He appealed earnestly to all reasonable men against this hateful and disastrous policy. To the reasonable and sane Ulster Protestants he would say, where would they be landed if this thing went on? Look at the facts. With the population all but three-fourths Catholics, were the Protestants trampled upon? In the first place, the land of Ireland was largely held by Protestants, and they were now getting hard cash and plenty of it for every

acre of that which originally cost their ancestors nothing. Until quite recently Protestants had all the privileges of an Established Church, and when the establishment ceased to exist, the Church was left with a capital of £8,000,000 sterling, and the Churches of other religious bodies had no such endowment, and must provide their own churches and manses—the only exception being the *regium donum* in the hands of the Presbyterian Church. Trinity College, up to 1873, was a strictly Protestant Institution, with an income of £30,000 per annum derived from confiscated Irish lands. And so far as salaried officers are concerned, it was the same to-day. Until quite recently the Secondary and Royal Schools, with all their endowments, were in the same hands. So much for the past. Look at the position at present. Of the six great Officers of State at the Castle, five are Protestants and only one Roman Catholic. There were, he thought, sixteen Superior Court Judges, and thirteen of these were Protestants. Of the six Land Commissioners, three were Catholics. Of the host of highly-paid officials in the Local Government Board, Land Commission, and Agricultural Department, not one-fourth were Catholics. The three Commissioners of Public Works were all Protestants. The Resident Magistrates and police officers were largely Protestant. In fact, through the whole official hierarchy the story was the same. The railway offices, banks, and breweries, were mainly manned by Protestants. Leaving salaried offices, and coming to positions of trust, what did they find? The Privy Councillors and Lords Lieutenants of counties and cities were almost exclusively Protestants. The predominance in the magistracy of Protestants was enormous. Up to the passing of the Local Government Act, the county patronage went the same way. No wrong was done to any official in the passing of the Act; but with the advent of democratic government, the growth of education, and the rise in the social status of those who

had been long proscribed, was it conceivable that the popular bodies should continue the policy of the old county authorities? The thing was inconceivable. He had used the word Protestant all through, but it ought not to be forgotten that there was a Presbyterian grievance in all this. Presbyterians were, up to quite recent times, as ruthlessly proscribed as Catholics. To-day they had nothing like what, by number, ability, intellectual and social position, they were entitled to—although they had as much as some of them deserved. But since the gentlemen who represent a party which has virtually had a monopoly of patronage chose to drag the country into this sectarian morass, he thought the time was opportune for Catholics and Presbyterians to say to any future Government:—'We resent the practical monopoly of offices of profit and of honour by one section; we desire fair play for all creeds; we desire equality of opportunity for all.' They ought to say firmly that in these matters the only ascendancy that could be tolerated is the ascendancy of character, ability, and fitness—of public worth. It was a shocking thing for public men to invent a baseless cry of the kind. He should do his best to prevent Ulster people from being misled or deceived. Sir Antony M'Donnell could not defend himself. In that fact lay the exceeding meanness of the attack. The truth, however, ought to be known. This able and distinguished servant of the Crown was lent by the Government of India to the Irish Government for a specific purpose. The Government desired to settle the agrarian feud, to provide better facilities for the higher education of Roman Catholics, to cut down the expenditure of useless offices, and to spend the money saved upon useful works in Ireland. It was a policy hateful to the ascendancy party; but it is nevertheless the policy of the Government which they are forced to support. Let them assail the Government then, not the instrument used to carry out its behests." So far Mr. Russell.

Let us now turn to the workhouses and asylums, which are under popular, and chiefly Catholic control.

In 1882 there were 163 workhouses in Ireland; but some have either disappeared, or have been amalgamated since then. At present there are 48 of these in which there is usually *no Protestant* inmate—

In	7	of these	the	Protestant	Minister	receives no salary.
,,	1	,,	,,	£4	a year for	attending to nobody.
,,	5	,,	,,	£5	,,	,, ,,
,,	2	,,	,,	£6	,,	,, ,,
,,	17	,,	,,	£10	,,	,, ,,
,,	2	,,	,,	£12	,,	,, ,,
,,	4	,,	,,	£15	,,	,, ,,
,,	5	,,	,,	£20	,,	,, ,,
,,	4	,,	,,	£25	,,	,, ,,
,,	1	,,	,,	£30	,,	,, ,,

Amongst the observations made to me on the above cases are:—"No Protestant service for some years;" the salary is £5 a year there. "Occasionally a tramp comes to the Infirmary who puts himself down a Protestant;" the salary is £25 a year there. "No Protestant inmate for years;" the salary is £10 a year there. "None for years past;' the salary is £4 a year. "For 9 years there have been only three Protestants inmates, often none;" the salary there is £20. The Guardians are nearly all Catholics; the Protestant Chaplain's salary was £5; he applied for an increase of salary, although there is usually no Protestant inmate, and at a time when there was actually none in the House The Guardians agreed to raise his salary to £20; but the Local Government Board thought it too much, and fixed it at £15." And so his salary has been raised from £5 to £15 for the increased labour of ministering to *nobody*. It is almost a "bull." "There has been no Protestant inmate for a long time;" the salary is £10. "For some

years there has been no Protestant inmate;" the salary is £10. "No Protestant in the Workhouse; very seldom a tramp may turn up who enters as a Protestant;" the salary is £10. "No Protestant inmate has been in the Workhouse for at least fifteen years;" the salary is £12. "There has been no Protestant for twelve years;" the salary is £6. "Very seldom there is a Protestant pauper;" the salary is £5. "The Protestant Chaplain never comes—he has no business to do—except to receive his salary every quarter;" it is £10. And so on. I find the following newspaper report of a recent meeting of the Guardians of the Ennis Union:—"At the suggestion of the Rev. Dr. Griffith, it was decided to advertise for a Protestant nurse at £12 a year. It was stated that there was only one Protestant in the house, a consumptive, in the consumptive ward, which drew from Mr. Glynn the observation '£1 a month and nothing to do is a fair thing.'" Nearly all the Guardians are Catholic; and there is usually no Protestant pauper in the Ennis Workhouse.

There are 25 Workhouses with only *one* Protestant pauper in each on an average—

In 8 of these	the Protestant Chaplain	receives	£10	a	year
,, 1	,,	,,	£15	,,	
,, 8	,,	,,	£20	,,	
,, 3	,,	,,	£25	,,	
,, 1	,,	,,	£26	,,	
,, 3	,,	,,	£30	,,	
,, 1	,,	,,	payment by capitation.		

There are 12 Workhouses with only two Protestant paupers in each on an average—

In 1 of these	the Protestant Chaplain	receives	£5	a	year
,, 3	,,	,,	£15	,,	
,, 1	,,	,,	£18	,,	
,, 5	,,	,,	£20	,,	
,, 1	,,	,,	£30	,,	
,, 1	,,	,,	£35	,,	

There are 12 Workhouses with only 3 Protestant paupers in each on an average—

In 1 of these the Protestant Chaplain receives £15 a year
,, 5 ,, ,, ,, ,, £20 ,,
,, 3 ,, ,, ,, ,, £25 ,,
,, 1 ,, ,, ,, ,, £26 ,,
,, 1 ,, ,, ,, ,, £30 ,,
,, 1 ,, ,, ,, ,, £35 ,,

There are 5 Workhouses with only 4 Protestant paupers in each on an average—

In 1 of these the Protestant Chaplain receives £10 a year
,, 1 ,, ,, ,, ,, £10 ,,
,, 1 ,, ,, ,, ,, £25 ,,
,, 2 ,, ,, ,, ,, £30 ,,

There are 5 Workhouses with only 5 Protestant paupers in each on an average—

In 2 of these the Protestant Chaplain receives £20 a year
,, 2 ,, ,, ,, ,, £30 ,,
,, 1 ,, ,, ,, ,, £50 ,,

There are 7 Workhouses with only 6 Protestant paupers in each on an average—

In 1 of these the Protestant Chaplain receives £20 a year
,, 4 ,, ,, ,, ,, £25 ,,
,, 2 ,, ,, ,, ,, £30 ,,

There is 1 Workhouse with 7 Protestant paupers on an average; the Protestant Chaplain receives £30 a year

There are 2 Workhouses with 8 Protestant paupers in each on an average—

In 1 of these the Protestant Chaplain receives £25 a year
,, 1 ,, ,, ,, ,, £35 ,,

Of the Workhouses in Ireland, I have thus accounted for 117. In these there are 194 Protestant paupers on an average; and the Protestant Chaplains, besides the one who is paid by capitation, receives £1,995 a year for attending them. Now, nearly all the Guardians of these 117 Workhouses are Catholics, those who pay the

poor-rates in those Unions are nearly all Catholics, and yet practically £2,000 a year is voted for the religious use of these 194 Protestant inmates of these 117 Workhouses; only 1.6 Protestants in each Workhouse on an average.

I do not write these things in complaint. I merely set them down in evidence of the sort of religious intolerance which is practised by Irish Catholics on these few Protestant paupers; who indeed are so few that their existence in a Workhouse at all is not creditable to the wealthy Protestants of Ireland. The money spent on trying to proselytise a certain degraded remnant of the Catholic poor if spent on those few Protestant paupers, would make a workhouse unnecessary for them. But Irish Protestantism has been more occupied in pulling down than in building up.

Let us now cross the Channel. On July 20th, 1882, the House of Commons ordered the printing of a *Return relating to Workhouse Chaplains in the United Kingdom*. From that Return I find that there are 641 Workhouses in England, and 63 in Scotland. There are few of them in which there are not some Catholic inmates. In each of about 100 of them there are upwards of 50 Catholic inmates. For instance, in Kensington there are 155 between the Workhouse and Infirmary. In Fulham there are 79. In Fulham Road there are 266 between the Workhouse and Infirmary. In Westminster, 236. In Marylebone, 454. In St. Pancras, 212. In Islington, 287. In St. Giles' 964. In the City Road, 320. In Archway Road, 420. In Whitechapel, 242. In Wapping, between Workhouse and Infirmary, 347. In Stepney, 242. Passing on to the provinces, there are in Stoke-on-Trent 104. In Wigan, 167. In Warrington, 172. In Wolverhampton, 158. In Birmingham, 565. In Birkenhead, 152. In Brownlow Hill, Liverpool, 1530. In Walton, 498. In Stoke-on-Trent, 104. Of course, the

priest, as part of his ordinary duty, attended to the inmates whether he was paid or not. But, according to the Return from which I quote, in hardly a dozen out of the 703 Workhouses did he receive any remuneration for his services. Of those 21 which I have named, only in Birmingham, Birkenhead, and Brownlow Hill, did he receive a salary—of £50, £45, and £150 a year respectively. I think it right to say, as I happen to know, that since the Return from which I quote was published, other Unions have followed the example of those few. I find that at present the priest receives remuneration from 75 Workhouses in England. But there are 641 in all, very few of which are without a few Catholic inmates, many have over a hundred, and several have hundreds. The movement is making slow progress, and is the result of repeated discussions, and of the persistent fight of years in some cases, made for fair play by Catholic or by tolerant non-Catholic guardians. Such disputes are going on still over the country, but so far without success, in Workhouses where there are hundreds of Catholic paupers. Of course, they are not left unattended to by the priest in any case for want of remuneration; but they cannot have Mass on Sundays without an additional priest, and no Catholic Mission in England can afford to tax itself to relieve the public at large of a plain duty. It was once part of my duty to attend to the inmates of one of those London Workhouses and Infirmaries which I have named, for which my Rector received about £80 a year. The Guardians voted it to him a short time before I went there; but up to that time he received nothing. I am pleased, however, to be able to set down here my remembrance of the kind attention and favour which the Guardians and the officials always showed me. I have given those statistics, not to point an invidious contrast, but to show what value is to be set on the cry of intolerance which

certain non-Catholics raise in season and out of season against the Catholics of Ireland.

Let us now turn to the Lunatic Asylums. I submit the following statistics for 15 out of 23 Asylums in Ireland:—

In one, where there are 20 Protestant patients, the Protestant chaplain receives £25 a year. In three, where there are 14, 9, and 10 Protestant patients respectively, the Protestant chaplain to each receives £30 a year; and he who is chaplain to the asylum with only 9 Protestant patients lately applied for an increase of salary. In one, where there are 42 Protestant patients, the Protestant chaplain receives £35 a year. In the same asylum, the Catholic chaplain who has charge of 447 patients receives only £70 a year. In one, where there are 35 Protestant patients, the Protestant chaplain receives £37 a year. In one, where there are 91 Protestant patients, the Protestant chaplain receives £60 a year. In two, where there are 43 and 102 Protestant patients respectively, the Protestant chaplain to each receives £50 a year. In one of these asylums there are 46 Presbyterians, for whom the Presbyterian chaplain receives £40 a year. In five, where there are 34, 40, 47, 50, and 58 Protestant patients respectively, the Protestant chaplain to each receives £40 a year. In the last-named there are 44 Presbyterian patients, for whom the Presbyterian chaplain receives £40 a year; and there are 582 Catholic patients, for whom the Catholic chaplain receives only £60 a year. In the first-named there are 4 Presbyterian patients, for whom the Presbyterian chaplain receives £20 a year. In the last but one there are 400 Catholic patients, and the Catholic chaplain receives only £70 a year. In one, where there are 175 Protestant patients, the Protestant chaplain receives £100 a year.

Now, let us compare that with what takes place in England.

I take the following extracts from "The Fifty-eighth Report of the Commissioners in Lunacy to the Lord Chancellor, ordered by the House of Commons to be printed 29th June, 1904":—

Salop and Montgomery Asylum:—"Patients of the Roman Catholic faith, being 30 in number, are visited periodically by a priest. This clergyman is unpaid. Somerset and Bath Asylums:—"There are no services provided for the Roman Catholic patients, who are 17 in number." Yorkshire (North Riding) Asylum:—"No service is provided for the 66 patients who profess the Roman Catholic faith." Yorkshire (West Riding) Asylum (1):—"For the 134 patients who profess the Roman Catholic faith no regular service is provided; but Mass is celebrated twice a year by a priest, who also visits the patients occasionally, but receives no remuneration." Yorkshire (West Riding) Asylums (3):—"A patient who professes the Roman Catholic faith, and who is a well-conducted and orderly man, complained, in very bitter terms, that no service was provided on Sunday, which he and the other 102 patients who profess the same faith could attend. Our colleagues have frequently expressed their regret that no regular service is held in this institution on Sunday for the Roman Catholic inmates, and we would again commend this matter to the very anxious consideration of the committee." Yorkshire (West Riding) Asylums (4):—"For the 155 patients who profess the Roman Catholic faith a weekly service is held in Ward 34; but we regret to report Mass is never celebrated, and the priest receives no remuneration for his services." Leicester Borough Asylum:—"There are 21 Roman Catholics whom a priest attends weekly, but he receives no stipend." Newcastle City Asylum:—"For the 162 patients who profess the Roman Catholic faith a

chapel morning service is also provided, although we regret to notice only once a month." And so on.

I do not want to insist on those extracts as an evidence of intolerance across the Channel. I merely state the facts; I assign no cause to them; I let them speak for themselves; their explanation will be more convincing than any commentary of mine. Let each one as he reads them, in the light of those facts which I have given on the provision for Protestant inmates in Irish workhouses and asylums, form his own judgment according to his own light.

CHAPTER XIX.

RELIGIOUS CORPORATIONS IN IRELAND; THEIR COST AND THEIR WORK.

"But it is not alone the extravagant church-building which, in a country so backward as Ireland, shocks the economic sense. The multiplication—in inverse ratio to a declining population—of costly and elaborate monastic and conventual institutions, involving what, in the aggregate, must be an enormous annual expenditure for maintenance, is difficult to reconcile with the known conditions of the country. Most of these institutions, it is true, carry on educational work, often, as in the case of the Christian Brothers and some colleges and convents, of an excellent kind. Many of them render great services to the poor, and especially to the sick poor. But, none the less, it seems to me their growth in number and size is anomalous. I cannot believe that so large an addition to the 'unproductive' classes is economically sound, and I have no doubt at all that the competition with lay teachers of celibates 'living in community' is excessive and educationally injurious. Strongly as I hold the importance of religion in education, I personally do not think that teachers who have renounced the world, and withdrawn from contact with its stress and strain, are the best moulders of the characters of youth who will have to come in direct conflict with the trials and temptations of life. But here again we must accept the situation, and work with the instruments ready to hand. The practical and statesmanlike action of all those concerned is to endeavour to render these institutions as efficient educational agencies as may be possible. They owe their

existence largely to the gaps in the educational system of this country, which religious and political strife have produced and maintained, and they deserve the utmost credit for endeavouring to supply missing steps in our educational ladder. If they now fully respond to the spirit of the new movements, and meet the demand for technical education by the employment of the most approved methods and equipment, and by the thorough training, on sound lines, of their staffs, it is impossible that the influence on the young generation should not be as salutary as it will be far-reaching." So writes Sir Horace.*

He says elsewhere that "whatever may be said in defence of the priest in politics in the past, there are the strongest grounds for deprecating a continuance of their political activity in the future;" that "in many other matters—social, educational, and economic—they have not been on the side of progress," but "that their influence is now, more than ever before, essential for improving the condition of the most backward section of the population." I would ask him, then, has a priest no civil rights, or has he no right to exercise them, unless, and so far as he gets permission or approval from some layman who undertakes to lecture him on the limits of his civil functions? No person can, I think, suspect me of an undue disposition to politics, since I have never made a political speech, and have never been present at a political meeting. But when he tells me that, being a priest, it is my duty to abstain from politics, and, at the same time, that it is my duty to occupy myself with economics, I have a right to ask him, why? If, on the other hand, some politician tells me that I should have nothing to do with economics, but that I ought to take part in politics, what am I to do between my two rival monitors?

* Pages 108-109.

This simply: I use those civil rights which I own equally with either of them, and I follow my own judgment setting aside the dictation of both. Sir Horace, being engaged in one phase of social work, gives his blessing to the priest in economics, and gives the back of his hand to the priest in politics; but, from a careful reading of his book, I have come to the conclusion that, to his mind, either in politics or in economics, the priest is, at best, a necessary evil, but a useful instrument under existing circumstances.

He seems to be of like mind with regard to religious communities, male and female. He thinks that in educational work they cannot be equal to the lay teacher. "But we must accept the situation, and work with the instruments ready to hand. The practical and statesmanlike action for all those concerned is to endeavour to render these institutions as efficient educational agencies as may be possible." In other words, making the best of a bad market, he would provisionally retain them. He is even good enough to think that "if they now respond to the spirit of the new movement, and meet the demand for technical education by the employment of the most approved methods and equipment, and by the thorough training, on sound lines, of their staffs, it is impossible that their influence on the young generation should not be as salutary as it will be wide-reaching;" which, being interpreted, means that if they faithfully follow his directions, place themselves unreservedly at the disposal of the Department and work under his control, he might be able to turn them to some use for the country. It is a delightful psychological study to observe such men posing as the supreme rule of right and truth, and assuming as a postulate that nobody else knows as well as they how to think or do anything.

With similar self-confidence Lecky sits on the tripod, and writes as much nonsense about religious life in a few

sentences as the oracle ever uttered at Delphi. He thinks that "the complete suppression of the conventual system was very far from a benefit to women, or to the world." He then gives his idea of what convents ought to be. But he says—"Most unhappily for mankind, this noble conception was from the first perverted." And the perversion consists in this:—"Institutions that might have had an incalculable philanthropic value were based upon the principle of asceticism, which makes the sacrifice, not the promotion, of earthly happiness its aim, and binding vows produced much misery and not a little vice." One would think that he lived in a convent, he knows so well the amount of *misery and vice which binding vows produce.* I know too well the wavering weakness of human nature to think that no member of a religious community has ever fallen a victim to vice. But whenever such a one has faltered or fallen, the fall came, not from "binding vows" according to religious rule, but from a personal "promotion of earthly happiness" against it; and it is only a corollary that a half-hearted member of a religious community must needs feel miserable. He himself would have invented a much better system than came from the combined wisdom of all the founders of communities since the hermits of the Thebaid—he would promote, rather than sacrifice, the earthly happiness of his community. He would inculcate the principle of hedonism instead of the principle of asceticism.

Ah! St. Augustine! St. Thomas Aquinas! I always took you to be the two greatest intellects which have shone in the world in the course of human history. I learned from you both that mortification is a virtue; but now I learn from Lecky that you have betrayed me. Let me go back to St. Basil and the early founders of Religious Communities; I find them thinking, teaching,

and acting under a like delusion. I go back to the early martyrs and confessors, and I find them equally foolish, for the latter suffered and the former died for the same mistake. They dressed a hard bed for themselves, without any need, if they only knew; in fact were guilty of a social evil by living and dying as they did. I go back to Apostolic times, and I find that St. Paul blundered badly when he told the Galatians that "they that are Christ's have crucified their flesh, with the vices and concupiscences." He plainly did not know his business. Had he the good luck to live nineteen centuries later, he could have learned from Lecky, as I learn from him now, that the true principle of asceticism is not the sacrifice, but the promotion of earthly enjoyment. To cut the matter short, Christ did not understand Christianity, else He would neither have fasted in the desert, nor suffered for our sake. He, too, perverted a noble conception when He sent His Apostles on their mission "without purse or scrip," a condition certainly which did not promote their earthly happiness. Yet He seems to have designedly settled those conditions of their Apostolate; He seems moreover to have counted the consequences and reckoned with the world, for He said to them: "If the world hate you, know you that it hated me before you; if you had been of the world, the world would love its own." But we have changed all that. St. Paul wrote about the law of the members warring against the law in the mind. There need be no such warfare. Let the spirit cave in, let the flesh have its way, and we shall realise "the promotion of earthly happiness," instead of perverting a noble conception by sacrificing it. Of course we are Christians still, but we have been improving on Christianity in every new edition of it we bring out. We have changed for the better the conception of Christ Himself. He was, we allow, a worthy moralist, a great

philosopher; but He was not so wise as we are. We have penetrated into the mysteries of the unseen world and have even discovered a modified form of the Godhead, Whom we view through the twilight or guess at behind a veil.

He is only a cloud and a smoke that was once a pillar of fire.

The guess of a worm in the dust, and the shadow of its desire.

The Book of Wisdom thus represents humiliated critics speaking of those whom they once thought fools:—"These are they whom we had some time in derision, and for a parable of reproach. We fools esteemed their life madness and their end without honour. Behold how they are numbered amongst the children of God, and their lot is among the saints. Therefore, we have erred from the way of truth, and the light of justice hath not shined unto us, and the sun of understanding hath not risen upon us."* If Lecky founded a religious community on his improved plan, his Religious would, before a twelvemonth, if they at all held together so long, have become a spectacle before angels and men. I am sure that the youngest novice in any convent in the country would smile at his simplicity, although, no doubt, he thought it profoundly wise to observe these flaws in the ideals of all the ascetics of Christian history. The following reveals more of the knowledge he had of convent life:—"The convent became the perpetual prison of the daughter whom a father was disinclined to endow, or of young girls who, under the impulse of a transient enthusiasm, or of a transient sorrow, *took a step which they could never retrace,* and useless penances and contemptible superstitions wasted the energies that might have been most beneficially employed." Evidently he learned more about convent life and condi-

* Chap. V.—3, 4, 5, 6.

tions in Trinity College, or from the May meetings of Exeter Hall than from any independent investigation of his own. Yet, in spite of all this, he goes on to say:—"Still it is very doubtful whether, even in the most degraded period, the convents did not prevent more misery than they inflicted, and in the Sisters of Charity the religious orders of Catholicism have produced one of the most perfect of all the types of womanhood. There is, as I conceive, no fact in modern history more deeply to be deplored than that the Reformers who, in matters of doctrinal innovations were often so timid, should have levelled to the dust, instead of attempting to regenerate, the whole conventual system of Catholicism."* There it is. Lecky thought that he knew more about religious life than all the ascetics from St. Benedict to St. Teresa; and yet anyone who does know anything about it, knows that he could hardly be more ignorant of it than he was. He plainly had no clear conception of the principles on which the Religious State is founded. Likewise Sir Horace Plunkett thinks that the spiritual children of St. Ignatius, St. Vincent de Paul, de la Salle, Edmund Rice, Nano Nagle, Catherine Macauley, etc., could not do better than get a course of instructions from the Department on the various duties for which those communities were respectively founded.

It does not come within the scope of my purpose to give the public a dissertation on the Theology of Ascetics. I merely observe, with all necessary respect, that I dare think St. Augustine, St. Thomas Aquinas, St. John of God, St. Francis de Sales, St. Teresa—all of them persons of the highest mental training and of surpassing natural gifts, specialists moreover in ascetics, more likely to know that subject incomparably better than amateurs can reasonably pretend to know it. It is curious that, whilst a physician will not presume to lecture lawyers on

* *History of European Morals*: Vol. II., pages 391-392.

jurisprudence, or a properly trained lawyer lecture physicians on therapeutics, a geologist lecture bacteriologists on the ways of germs or lecture engineers on the building of bridges, a carpenter lecture a tailor on how to cut out a suit of clothes, persons are to be found in every walk of life who, drawing out an idea from their inner consciousness and fixing that pet idea immovably as on a pedestal, make it the test of theological truth, and pass sentence without a suspicion of being ridiculous on all the theologians and metaphysicians who have written, from St. Augustine to Rosmini.

It is, of course, easy to see why all men should take an interest in such subjects as theology and sociology, for all have a common concern in what these studies explain. But that a dilettante should play the expert, and expect the public to sit under his *cathedra*, is quite another thing. John Stuart Mill wisely remarks, I think it is in his *Autobiography*, that "a man who knows only his own side of a question knows little of that."

Sir Horace Plunkett does not deal directly with Religious Communities as to their interior life, but as to their relations with the public in the various external functions which they undertake. It is in this latter phase of their life that I propose to consider his criticisms; but in the course of what I am about to write I will refer in passing to the former in so far as he involves it in the latter.

I take up this position:—When Religious Communities, of men or women, undertake public duties of a secular nature, maintained at the public cost, they bind themselves thereby to efficiency according to the requirements of public authority, and they may not ask the public to consider their religious character as an apology for inferior work. I take up that position from the outset, to relieve myself of any reasonable suspicion of special pleading. I mean to make no *ad misericordiam* plea in favour of Religious Congregations; and before I

have finished I hope to have made it clear that they do not need any. Those who on one ground or another dislike or disapprove of Catholicism have at all times marked out for their first object of attack those who are in a special way representative of it, priests and nuns who are bound to it not only by the common bond of faith, but also by office and vow, and those amongst the laity who have distinguished themselves as its champions or apologists. Only the other day Dr. Mahaffy abused the courtesy of the Catholics who invited him to speak at a lecture on the Catholic University Question by singling out the priests as bearing a special brand of bigotry. It was his unbecoming method of placating the Catholic laity, whereas the clumsy compliment implied that his audience were too obtuse to detect the covert implication that they were only Popish slaves.

At the Reformation the cry of Protestantism was—Cut down monks and nuns, why cumber they the ground? To-day Protestantism is in many places constructing imitations of Catholic Community life, of men and women. Lecky admits the mistake then made when he says that "no fact in modern history is more deeply to be deplored than that the Reformers should have levelled the monasteries and convents to the dust instead of attempting to regenerate the whole conventual system of Catholicism." All eminent non-Catholic writers deplore the same mistake, and many of them in less qualified terms. Sir Horace Plunkett does not ask to have them levelled to the dust; he merely calls for their regeneration, by lessening their numbers and by improving the work done by those that remain.

I observe, first of all, that no Religious Community, of men or women, can be established in a diocese without the sanction of the Bishop; and I assume that a Bishop knows the requirements of his diocese a great deal better than outsiders can teach him.

That consideration alone is enough to put out of court any outsider who takes upon himself the task of upbraiding us for the number, extent, or expense of our monastic and conventual institutions. I put the matter thus bluntly—What is it to him, or to any outsiders, what Catholics think of their religious organization or what they do with their own? When have Catholics commissioned Sir Horace to pass sentence on their action in relation to religious institutions for which neither he nor his are asked to pay? Can he name any representative Catholic or body of Catholics who have undertaken the unbecoming task of passing sentence on similar action on the part of Protestants? Catholics have never interfered or complained of Protestant religious work, unless in cases where they have been saddled with a share of the burden, or when its purpose is proselytism. They do more; I recall, as one instance only, the £2,000 a year which Catholic guardians vote towards the spiritual concerns of 195 Protant inmates of Irish workhouses. I pass over the Protestant churches we have built, the church rates, the tithes, the minister's money we have paid, and the many other burdens which we have borne in the interest of Protestantism in Ireland. These people have been so long and so much in the habit of interfering with, and of insulting us with impunity, that they have come to think they can go on doing so freely and for ever. Sir Horace has received, as he himself indeed avows, a great deal of patronage and help from bishops, priests, and nuns, in his industrial mission throughout the country. I fear it has spoiled him; and perhaps some "enlightened Catholics," with more of the economic than of the Catholic sense, have misled him. He does not understand us; he has mistaken our co-operation for thoughtless gratitude on which he might play at will without penalty or limit; he has intruded himself through the windows as

well as by the door into the sanctuary of our household, and he has no right to complain if he be given the alternative either to behave himself within or to suffer the indignity of being bowed out. He cannot, of course, be expected to appreciate our faith, but he might have understood the value *we* set upon it from the sacrifices we have made for its sake. Although it has not been the cause, it has been the occasion of those disabilities of the past and of those drawbacks of the present which he equally, and I am sure sincerely, deplores. Our poverty is simply the material price we have paid for our spiritual principles. He tells us that we are squandering money which we should have kept, as well as losing money which we might have secured, owing to our foolish notions of religious requirements. I think his charge against us blameable, not because it goes too far, but because it does not go at all far enough. The deception of his position is in the mildness of his complaint; his charge should be immeasurably more comprehensive to be wholly true. Why, we have lost *everything* for our Faith, and for those notions which he thinks foolish—our land, our commerce, our industries, our civil and religious liberty, the very churches which we built to practise it, letting the shell be winnowed by every storm that came and preserving the seed and the substance only by concealing it—for its sake we lost everything that is earthly except honour. And now when that seed, so long hidden and cherished by stealth in the bogs and in the woods, is again sown in every plain and valley of the land, and is blossoming into the bloom, the beauty, and the grandeur of other days, Sir Horace crosses over from his potato garden, a grafting knife in one hand, a spray pot in the other, and prescribing economic remedies to regulate the growth and to prune the blossoms. As Catholics we are unintelligible to him. It is not a question to be decided by economics; and the

economist in the case is only as a red herring across the path. That there are points of contact with economics is not unknown to me, and my readers may depend upon it that I am not going to shelve or shirk the question. I mean to face it more plainly than, I suspect, Sir Horace and the economists think that I dare. Meanwhile, I give the following to illustrate one point of contact between the "economic sense" and Catholic practices. I take it from a letter addressed to Lord Cloncurry, on December 11th. 1829, by Dr. Doyle—ᴀ'ʏ ᴛɴuᴀʂ ʂᴀn oıʊıɹ 'nᴀ-ʊ-ɹᴀnnᴀᴐ !

It was a reply to a letter addressed by Lord Cloncurry to the Secretary of the Society for the Improvement of Ireland, in which his Lordship suggested to the heads of the Roman Catholic Church that "the Saints days and holidays observed by our people in greater number than in any other country are a great loss to the country, and a great cause of one of the besetting evils—drunkenness." Amongst other mistakes in the letter, Dr. Doyle says that "holidays are not observed in greater number by our people than in any other country; that the sum total of our holidays which in any way interfere with public industry are reduced to six or seven in the year. . . . I do not think that drunkenness—our besetting sin—our permanent plague —would be materially lessened by the abolition of all the holidays, for drunkards will drink at all times; and when they do not find a holiday ready-made, they themselves make one for the purpose. Witness *Saint Monday*, which an impious, and besotted, and abominable race of tradesmen, add to the Lord's Day, for the purpose of indulging in their horrid excesses. Look also to the Presbyterians of the North, who observe no holidays. Nor do I think that an obligation of resting from servile works on six days, besides the Sundays, throughout the year, can be any loss whatever in a

country where the market is always overstocked with labour, and in which a man's labour is not worth, at an average, more than three-pence a day. Add to this, that in cases of great necessity or public utility, every person is permitted to work upon holidays. The truth is, my Lord, that when idlers were few and labourers many, and when holidays were more numerous than they now are, the peasantry were better fed and better clothed than they are at present; besides which, frequent holidays—or days of prayer for some, and of rest and amusement for all—contributed not a little to produce and to preserve that gay, cheerful, friendly, strong, and athletic race of men, which by-and-by will be nowhere to be found in Ireland. It is not the peasant now who gains by his labour, or loses, I might say, by his rest; it is the employer or the driver of the slave. Are our peasants not broken down and withered at forty or fifty years of age? Are they not everywhere badly fed and over-worked? And we who idle *six* days and do not labour *one*, would, when we have made them vicious and miserable, bind them down even in their few holidays, like a slave to the oar."

One of the charges brought by the Reformers against the Catholics was that industry was restrained by the number of their holidays, and the same cry has been constantly raised in the name of economics, from Sir William Petty in the 17th century down to Lecky in our own time. Yet Monday was observed in Great Britain from Cromwell's time, but after the manner described by Dr. Doyle. It began, I believe, on the occasion of the death of one of Cromwell's followers named Monday. Cromwell offered a reward for the best lines on his death, and a shoemaker produced the following:—

Blessed be the Sabbath Day,
  And cursed be worldly pelf;
Tuesday will begin the week,
  Since Monday's hanged himself.

Cromwell recognised the excellence of the epitaph by granting the shoemakers a holiday every Monday.

In recent years Bank holidays were introduced by Sir John Lubbock, on the ground that the British workingman had too much work and too little recreation, and the Catholics of Ireland, except in the diocese of Ferns, where the men of Wexford have stood by their own, have yielded up their ancient holidays so far as servile work is concerned, and have followed the Britisher in keeping St. Lubbock's day, that is, in the manner in which Bank holidays are kept. More recently half-days have been taken from business every week and given to recreation. I pass no judgment on those holidays which, in obedience to the orders of industrialism, we have accepted from across the Channel to the neglect of our own. I refer to them merely to illustrate the inconsistency of our critics. For what is the difference between our own ancient holidays and those new and more numerous ones which we have adopted in their place? None that I can see, except that these arose from the worship of Mammon, and ours arose from the worship of God and the honour of His Saints. Our national holidays weathered the storms of persecution and outlived the penal days, and I own it is not creditable to us that we have pliantly discarded them for exotics in the days of our freedom. The Gaelic League has had to force the observance of St. Patrick's Day on the country, and their struggle is not yet over, nor has the country become yet quite reconciled to it.

Adam Smith divided a nation into two classes—the productive and the unproductive. Sir Horace evidently adopts that division, but I cannot say if he follows it fully in the sense of its author. If he does, he had better refresh his economic studies, because no economist of name follows it now. Some, as Sidgewick, Marshall, and Nicholson have substituted another distinction;

and some, confused by its absurd consequences, have done without any substitute, and have run into conclusions as absurd as those which had scared them. One would think from what he writes that those only who live in religious communities belong to what he calls the "unproductive classes." But, adopting his division, lawyers, physicians, artists, scientific and literary men, officers of the army and navy, civil servants, statesmen, even the personnel of the Department belong to that class; and of some of these, at any rate, I think that the country has a great many more than are good for it.

The right of free association is one of those imprescriptible rights sanctioned and boasted of in modern society, rights allowed even in cases of questionable consequences to public or private good. Why, then, should not a number of persons—men or women—be equally free to associate in religious corporations to serve God according to their light? It may be a vain and foolish thing to do. Be it so; but they have the right to do it, and the further right to remind those who censure them to mind their own business. A Carthusian monk might write a letter to the newspapers and say that we have too many military officers; in fact that, since two kennels of champion mastiffs could settle an international quarrel of right quite as rationally—or rather quite as irrationally—as two armies mowing each other down with cannon and rifle, all military expenses are so much money wasted; that the Department costs too much for the work it shows, or that as useful a building as the New College of Science might be erected for a fraction of what the Department has proposed to spend on it. The man with the "economic sense" might reply that those institutions are most important for the State. But the recluse might rejoin that there are human interests immeasurably more important than the concerns of the State, and that the association

to which he belongs was formed to promote those higher human interests. His rejoinder would "shock the economic sense;" that I know. But what reply could the economist make? That I want to know. I can imagine one who is accustomed to class as articles of value only those things which he can taste or touch, turning disdainfully on the Carthusian and taunting him with wasting his life in prayer which has no market value, in an association which no stockbroker would register in his lists; but I can also imagine the bright, calm eye of the recluse pitifully turned on him, followed by that phrase of the great interpreter of the modern spirit—"More things are wrought by prayer than this world dreams of."

Sir Horace will remind me that he does not object to religious communities, but to the extravagant increase in their number, inasmuch as they are not producers but consumers only, living on the wealth made by the productive classes of the country. Now, I think that M. Combes is a more consistent economist than Sir Horace. He has no right to stop short at merely preventing their growth or cutting down their number. If they do not produce, but only consume at the cost of producers, the "practical and statesmanlike action" in their regard should be either to drive them out, or to starve them out of their communities. The honest question to consider in their regard is not—why cumber they the ground so much? but, why cumber they the ground at all? M. Combes is, in my opinion, a better logician, and conforms his conduct to his principles more consistently than Sir Horace. What right has he, or any statesman, to permit such "unproductive classes" to exist at all, especially since even those of them who teach are, he tells us, inferior to lay teachers as "moulders of the characters of youth," and compete with the latter to the undoubted injury of education? Being a practical statesman, he advises to "accept the situation, and work with the instruments

ready to hand," would "endeavour to render these institutions as efficient educational agencies as may be possible," which means that they are a worthless lot, whom, however, circumstances make it wiser to use till they can be got rid of. Yet he says that under certain conditions "it is impossible that their influence on the young generation should not be as salutary as it will be wide-reaching." He evidently does not approve of Catholic religious communities of any sort, or in any sense; but he thinks it unwise to say so, and therefore he lurches about into those inconsistencies.

I pass over the great historical fact that the fairest spots in Ireland and Great Britain have been made so by the labours of mediæval religious communities, that the former wastes and forests of Italy, Germany, and France were reclaimed and fertilised by their toil. I also pass over the fact that religious communities are, in relation to the number of Catholics, much more numerous in England and in America than in Ireland; but in this, as in other alleged Catholic extravagances Ireland is segregated as a scape-goat—*chi offende non perdona*, an Italian proverb says.

Restricting my observations to Ireland, besides the religious communities who work for the public, there are those who are engaged wholly or chiefly in the contemplative life, such as the Trappists of Mount Mellarey and Roscrea, and the Redemptoristine and Carmelite nuns. I am not aware that any of these have built their houses or are supported at the public expense. I should be curious to learn from Sir Horace a single instance in which they have appealed to the public. Individuals may have given them gifts or left them bequests, which they had a perfect right to do if they thought well of it, just as Sir Horace himself, I believe, generously hands over his salary to promote the work of the Organisation Society. The late Count Moore, I believe, purchased their

place for the Trappists at Roscrea. If he started a factory there, Sir Horace would, no doubt, think the money better spent. But the Count thought differently; and who knows but he was right? This I do know; I knew him well, and I believe that he was at least as well made up in economics as Sir Horace. In neither case has anyone a right to interfere by criticism or by complaint. The Little Sisters of the Poor have succeeded in erecting, from time to time, a splendid cluster of buildings in the suburbs of Cork. Where did the money come from? I do not know, nor have I any right to know; neither has the public, since they have not appealed to the public for help. The Sisters go about begging money, old clothes, broken bread, meat, anything; but they can show more work than these alms they get could account for, in the numbers of poor people whom they clothe and support in a manner much superior to the maintenance given in the workhouses out of the rates, and without killing the self-respect of their clients, which is one of the most degrading features of that system of poor relief with which the State economists have cursed the country. The contemplative communities are supported, I presume, by the dowries of their members. I know two young ladies who recently entered one of these communities with dowries amounting probably to about £4,000 between them. All have not such large dowries, but each must bring something. Nuns live very simply; they make their own habits, cook their own food, and so their maintenance costs very little. Naturalistic economists, of course, think that those large dowries would be better spent on industrial work; on which I make no remark except that those who owned the dowries think otherwise. The "economic sense" may be shocked that those ladies bury their money on the country, and deprive the public of the industrial work they might do by remaining in the world. But, pray, how would the "economic

sense" be influenced by the action of those ladies if they spent their money on the conventional extravagances of what is called "society," and spent their time at balls or theatres in the night, and talking drawing-room trivialities or selecting fashions during the day? Their money and their lives would bear abundant fruit for industrial Ireland—would they not? But my simple and direct apology is—that those ladies do the work they have set themselves to do, and they should be let do it free from the criticism of those who do not understand them, and with whose own ways and works they do not interfere. The first principle of liberty is to respect the liberty of others; but our critics, palpitating as it were with the spirit of modern life, do not seem to grasp that first principle of the programme which they pretend to plead for. If those ladies formed a club, and took a winter residence in the Riviera or at Monte Carlo, or handed over each her dowry to a husband who would squander it on the turf, or gamble it on the Stock Exchange, they would escape the censures of those critics who ignorantly decry the path of life they have chosen, and insolently question their liberty to choose it. St. Paul said:—"*Animalis homo non percipit ea quae sunt spiritus Dei*"; ay, there's the rub.

The contemplative life of course has no value in the eyes of the mere economist. Naturally, since the work of that life cannot be catalogued as an *article of value* in the technical language of economics; nor do I propose to explain its value for the economist's sake, because I should speak in a language which he does not understand; and what our outside critics cannot understand about Catholic ideals and ways is, they assume, neither worth consideration nor intelligible in itself. I am quite prepared to hear that they have been confirmed in their judgment by "enlightened Catholics," those, namely, who have passed through the miraculous process

of learning Catholic principles and Catholic teaching in non-Catholic institutions where those things are never taught, and who have improved their "Catholic" studies in after life by imbibing the spirit of such society as fosters those "enlightened" views on Catholic life and principles which are the heirloom and the tradition of Trinity College. It is curious that those alone are classified by themselves as well as by outsiders as "enlightened Catholics" who happen to disown everything Catholic that displeases them, or is disapproved by those whose patronage they pursue. I can quite understand all that, and in a sense they have my sympathy. If the uninitiated go into a laboratory of physical science, seeing the strange instruments and the experts at work, they can discern nothing but toys and pastime, and if they listen to the views of the factotums employed to keep the place in order, instead of getting better informed they will be led more astray. The case of our critics is similar in relation to Catholic principles and practices, and to be led by "enlightened Catholics" is only to be led astray; it is the blind leading the blind, and both tumbling into the same ditch.

To pass sentence on religious communities on the mere economic test of whether they belong to the *productive* or to the *unproductive* class is in the last analysis to value the work of men and women by the standard of cattle made for man's use. We take account of what they consume and of what they produce, then balance our books, and if the balance is at the wrong side we account them as profitless animals, as barren fig-trees which should be cut down. But if we take and weigh the value of our critics with their own balance, what do we find? Not that they do uneconomic work, but that many of them do no work of any kind. Some of those who decry the useless life of religious communities are

those who, either from want of brains or want of ballast, have failed to make even a decent livelihood for themselves. Some belong to the "unproductive classes," but they live idly on their own income. And if the mere economist will classify man as a *productive* being, what apology for his presence can he make to the man of manual labour in the garden, in the factory, or in the mine, who insists on claiming that he alone is the real producer, and that the capitalist, the writer on industrialism, the economist himself are to be catalogued in the same category with the Trappist and the Visitandine?

CHAPTER XX.

THE CRITICS OF CONVENTS CRITICISED; NUNS, THEIR CIVIL RIGHTS AND THEIR WORK.

My position then is that religious communities who do no work for the public benefit have no claim on public support; for, if persons, men and women, think well of retiring from the outside world to such a community for the purpose of practising the Evangelical counsels, that is their own concern only, and they have no right to expect the outside world which they renounced, to bear the burden of their maintenance. But if they maintain themselves, those who may not approve of the life they have chosen, have no right to question their choice.

But the vast majority of religious communities in Ireland do not follow the contemplative life; they follow either the mixed or the active life. I propose to consider chiefly religious communities of women; because, though critics assume the task of criticising them at will, they cannot defend themselves.

Nuns do various works. Some are engaged in nursing; and of these some undertake private nursing, and some undertake the work in public Institutions. Some devote their lives to teaching; and of these, some have private schools, and some teach in public schools as under the National Board. Some devote their lives to Orphanages and to Penitentiaries; and so on. Now, with regard to those who undertake the work of private nursing or of teaching private schools, I hold that they have no claim on anyone except on those for whose

benefit they teach or nurse; and their being members of a religious community gives them thereby no right to public support. If a few young ladies join in establishing a private hospital or a private school, they acquire no claim to public support unless in so far as they earn it, and if they were to form themselves into a permanent community by making religious vows under the sanction of Ecclesiastical authority, no superadded claim upon the public would come with their vows and their change of life. Neither, on the other hand, would they forfeit by their religious life any rights which they had before, unless in so far as they willingly had vowed them away. The rest remain as untouched as if they had never made a religous vow.

A young lady has as inalienable a right to enter a Convent as she has to live with her family or to get married; and when she has exercised that right she continues to own, in face of the public, every civil right to teach or nurse, or to occupy herself with any civil functions, which she had before. She may not exercise those only which are not permitted by the rules of the community of which she voluntarily became a member. I have heard the foolish question asked—What if all ladies became nuns? To which the answer is easy: there is no fear. Those who think the life of nuns a life of ease and uselessness will soon learn better, and will leave when their temper has been tested and their character sifted by a few months' noviciate. Let those who doubt it only try, and their doubt will soon become a certainty.

The critics of Convents have curious consciences. Let a lady get married, or remain single for life; let her spend her days sporting in the hunting field, or dawdling in a drawing room; let her go gambling to Monte Carlo and lose as much money in a day as would keep a whole convent for a century; let her join the

society founded by Madam Blavatsky and become a Mahatma, or that founded by Mrs. Eddy, and become a Christian scientist, or let her spend her life searching for spooks; let her join a proselytising society which proceeds with unlimited funds to sow the seed of the Word in the Aran Isles, and be called "sister;" let her do as she likes, and no word of reproach is ever spoken or written against her. But let her use her imprescriptible right to lead a life of celibacy, penance, and prayer in a Convent; let her join the society founded by Catherine Macauley, Nano Nagle, or Mary Aikenhead, and she is at once "immured," doomed to a dungeon; the piety of Protestantism is plentifully poured out in criminations and in crocodile tears for the Evangelical light that has been quenched and for the civil liberty which has been torn from her. The "economic sense" is shocked for the reason that the Convent which she has entered is one of those upas trees which poisons the public and paralyses the spirit of national industrialism —an octopod that gathers into itself the wealth of the country, but, being of the "unproductive class," does not contribute in any way towards the upkeep or the prosperity of the nation on which it preys.

Now, what is a community of nuns who nurse or teach but a society of ladies devoted to either work? The difference between them and other ladies who may associate in the work of nursing or teaching is that the primary purpose of the latter is to make a living, and the prime motive of the former is to sanctify themselves. But the primary object of either should have no concern for me or for anyone else if they give capable and assiduous care to the patients, and if they educate well the pupils committed to their care. Nuns who are engaged in such works make their own arrangements with their clients, and it is to be assumed that those who patronize them for either work understand what

suits themselves as well as others can tell them. At any rate, their own judgment is their own business, and if they choose to turn their patronage elsewhere they are quite free to do so. I have known several non-Catholic parents in England who placed their daughters in Convent schools; many non-Catholics in England send their daughters to Convents in France, Belgium, and Germany; and the same happens very frequently in America. If these parents did not think they would get good educational value for their money at those Convents, there is nothing to keep them from looking for better elsewhere. And confining our consideration to Ireland, Convent schools like other schools of course differ in efficiency; but comparing them grade for grade with the best and the mediocre schools taught by non-Catholic ladies, I think that they educate better than these. If anyone tell me I am mistaken, I will want to know where I am to find superior results from secular institutions. I know Catholic ladies engaged in teaching to whom I would entrust the training of girls as readily as to any Convent; but I think that the cases are exceptional, taking into account the prime motive which nuns have in their work, and the strict discipline under which their Rules and their Rev. Mothers constantly keep them.

During the past few years the education of girls has taken a more practical turn. A training in domestic economy, as an essential element in the ideal of a girl's education, is supplanting the æsthetic refinements of the past. I think that the practical formation of a housekeeper has been too much neglected in the education of girls, and I have no disposition to shield our convent schools from their share of the defect. In this neglect they yielded chiefly to the wishes of parents who, influenced by the spirit which pre-

vailed amongst their "betters," would have practical training give way to the ornamental accomplishments of their daughters; and the disposition which would have that education in school, fostered and developed it at home. As teachers, nuns could not entirely withstand the wishes of their clients. There was nothing bad in it except from an educational standpoint; and some of the nuns themselves had, like others, passed through the same process, and were probably not fully conscious of its consequences. But when all is said, nuns in my opinion cannot be quite excused for having yielded to the prevailing disposition as much as they have yielded. In saying this, I am expecting more from them than from others; I judge them by a higher standard. But that admission does not justify their critics, because at the worst they have merely more or less neglected an important element in education which was equally or more neglected in non-Catholic and secular schools. Yet, since the cry for domestic economy has been raised it has grown into an extravagance with some, and those who are always ready to throw discredit on convents instinctively turned their criticism exclusively on nuns, as if they alone, or chiefly, had neglected the practical and the useful in the education they imparted. During the *Irish Times* epidemic, when the "Roman Catholic farmer" from Killaloe relieved his soul of Canon M'Inerney's enormities,* other "Roman Catholic" correspondents told us of Catholics who have decided to remain single rather than jeopardise their happiness with a Catholic wife who, owing to her Convent education, could not superintend their kitchen or the arrangements of their home. We were, of course, expected by these anonymous letter-writers to suppose that those unnamed heroes of the faith, failing to find a suitable Catholic wife, would rather bear the martyrdom

* See page 13 and *note*.

of single blessedness than propose for a Protestant lady and embark on a mixed marriage, or that it was not the case that they proposed for both and were accepted by neither. Genuine Irish Catholic girls are never short of proposals to share a home with them; but they would hardly accept proposals from those who forget their chivalry in their desire to damn Convents, and who by implication thus belittle the Catholic maidens and matrons of Ireland.

I have no wish to make invidious comparisons in other respects, but my experience both here and in England has impressed me that in the sphere of domestic economy, Catholic and non-Catholic housekeepers, those who have been educated in convents and those who have been educated elsewhere, taking them grade by grade in the social scale, have about equal merit.* A lady who was educated in one of the highest Protestant educational establishments in this country told me lately that, her

* I take the following from *Truth* of Nov. 24th, 1904:—

"The following letter, which reached me the other day from the North of England, seems to me worthy of notice. It is a standing grievance that the people who pay the most rates get the least advantage out of them, and I can readily believe that there is room for the extension of technical education in the direction indicated by my correspondent:—

"'DEAR TRUTH.—The County Councils send out teachers of laundry-work, cookery, dairying, etc., for the benefit of the country districts; they do nothing, however, for the education of those who are most heavily rated. People rated at £1,000 or £2,000 per annum ought to have the opportunity of learning as much as the daughter of a farmer or a parson rated at £50. There is one subject in which education is specially needed—namely, practical housekeeping and the management of servants. I think the County Councils should supply experts who would visit all the big houses in the country, look through the housekeeping books, and make reports with suggestions. They might also hold classes in convenient centres for the benefit of ladies and housekeepers. Apart from the educational work, the visits of the County Council's experts would have a valuable effect in opening the eyes of masters of houses to the great and needless waste of money that goes on in their establishments. Awful as is the waste of money on dress, far larger is the waste of money on housekeeping.'"

Those to whom the above complaint refers have not been educated in Convents, nor are they Irish.

family having suffered reverses of fortune, she had, on leaving school, to make a livelihood for herself, and that though she had learned painting and music, could play on two or three instruments, she was utterly ignorant of housekeeping, and found herself without any equipment for the battle of life. She is a person of uncommon intelligence, has been married for some years, and she has become one of the best housekeepers I have ever known. I do not mention this for the purpose of reflecting on non-Catholic institutions. I merely want to point out that domestic economy has been more or less neglected everywhere. But no sooner did a better impulse move the public to wiser ways than the nuns began to put their house in order, and I think they are well abreast of the new movement. Why, then, should they be singled out for criticism and blame, as if domestic economy did not form a sufficiently important part of the curriculum of their schools alone?

I wish it to be observed that I have considered exclusively what I may call this material element in the education of girls. I do not forget that there are other elements in their education which are more important than cookery for the permanent happiness of homes, more powerful mainstays of family life; in consideration of which French infidels, who declaim in frenzy against Convents and clerical Colleges in the Chamber of Deputies, send their sons and their daughters by preference to be educated in both. I remember that some of them were publicly taunted with the inconsistency a few years ago in The Chamber. The Belgian liberals, or infidels as we would call them, also sent their daughters to Convent Schools instead of to Institutions under lay control. But I have kept exclusively to those points on which Convent critics specially fasten for their complaints.

CHAPTER XXI.

NUNS AS TEACHERS AND NURSES.

I NOW consider the nuns who teach in public schools, and I test their efficiency by public returns. The following table shows the percentage of pupils who passed the results Examinations in Irish National Schools during the six following years:—

Year.	Passes in Model Schools.	Passes in Convent and Monastery Schools.
1885	88·7	88·9
1886	90·0	90·1
1887	89·9	89·4
1888	89·4	89·6
1889	88·1	89·5
1890	88·4	89·2

I have taken these percentages from a speech made by the Archbishop of Dublin about fourteen years ago. They speak for themselves. We must bear in mind also that the pupils of the Model schools belong to the more wealthy and comfortable classes. They attend school regularly, and they have home advantages for study which the children of the poor, such as generally attend the Convent National Schools, have not.

I take the following from the Report of Mr. Dale, who was commissioned last year to inquire into the condition of primary schools in Ireland. He writes*:— "Dingy walls or ceilings, broken woodwork or plaster, and dirty floors are far more common in Irish town schools than in English. From these last observations

* Report of Mr. F. H. Dale, His Majesty's Inspector of Schools, Board of Education, on Primary Education in Ireland. Page 3.

I am glad to be able to except the Convent schools. I found them in all cases kept in an excellent state of repair, cleanliness, and neatness;" and in a note:—"It is interesting to note that the Assistant Commissioners to the Powis Commission in 1868, especially commended the Convent schools on these same grounds." Again:—"It is noteworthy that the 292 Convent schools paid on the English system by a lump sum from the State, for the proper distribution of which the community conducting the schools is primarily responsible, are at once the least expensive to the State, and among the most efficient and best-managed schools in Ireland. The average cost of maintenance to the State per child in average attendance at these schools was only £1 17s. 11½d., as against £2 8s. 5d. in the ordinary National schools; yet they are far better furnished and provided with a more adequate staff than the ordinary schools. I have already had occasion to comment on the admirable cleanliness and neatness of the premises and the excellence of the equipment; but these are only a few among many advantages of the careful supervision and management which are the indispensable conditions of the success of an elementary school. I was impressed in every Convent school that I visited, by the knowledge and interest shown by the conductors, even when not actually teaching in the school, with regard to all the details of the school-work and organisation, and by their readiness to consider and, if possible, to adopt any changes in the curriculum or organisation which the Central Office might consider would render their schools more efficient."†

Again:—"It is noteworthy that in the Convent schools, though the pupils are frequently drawn from the very poorest classes, the percentage of average attendance to the average number on rolls is 69.7, and

† Report of Mr. F. H. Dale. Page 45.

in many individual schools, *e.g.*, the King's Inn Street Convent school in Dublin, reaches 75"‡

Again:—"It is impossible to doubt the admirable influence which the teachers in these schools (*i.e.* Convent schools) have over their pupils or the training which is given in habits of order, neatness, and ready obedience. In any broad view of what is involved in the education of children of the poorer classes, these merits, though not capable of being measured with the same definiteness as intellectual proficiency, are not less deserving of recognition. With regard to the instruction, the reading of the older children was generally better than in the ordinary schools, and in some Convent schools, notably the Josephian Convent in Dublin, and the St. Vincent's Convent in Cork, reached a very high standard as regards intelligence and distinctness. It is interesting to note that the same point of superiority impressed itself on several of the Assistant Commissioners to the Powis Commission; and the reason assigned by one of them for it is, I think, in substance correct, that the Sisters controlling the schools are, as a rule, ladies of higher education and better social position than ordinary National teachers. The composition was also, as a rule, above that produced in the National schools. I cannot, however, say that the arithmetic reached so high a level of accuracy as in the best National schools, and it was not more intelligent. Nor did the instruction in geography and grammar impress me as being essentially different in character from that on which I have already commented."§

Again:—"The curriculum of the Convent schools has for many years been wider than that of most ordinary National schools. Singing and drawing were commonly taught long before they were made compulsory by the New Programme. Of the proficiency in singing it

‡ Page 56. § Page 66.

would be difficult to speak too highly; in some of the Convent schools, *e.g.*, the Sligo Convent, the Queenstown Convent, and the St. Vincent's Convent at Cork, it was equal to any that I have heard in the best English schools. The physical exercises were also well done."¶

Yet Sir Horace tells us that he has "no doubt at all that the competition with lay teachers of celibates 'living in community' is excessive and educationally injurious." He has, however, kept his reasons to himself; but after what I have just now written, the public might be curious to know them. I also recall that he "personally does not think that teachers who have renounced the world and withdrawn from contact with its stress and strain are the best moulders of the characters of youths who will have to come into direct conflict with the trials and temptations of life. But here again we must accept the situation and work with the instruments ready to hand." What those "instruments ready to hand" for the teaching of girls are like, we have learned from the statistics and the reports which I have quoted. He is good enough to say that "they deserve the utmost credit for endeavouring to supply missing steps in the educational ladder" in the past. Mr. Dale, however, thinks that they do a great deal more even in the present. Besides other proofs of excellence in Convent teaching which Mr. Dale gives, he also refers to the "training which is given in habits of order, neatness, and ready obedience." I think that girls who are trained to be orderly and neat, and to so far control themselves as to give ready obedience in school, are having their characters well moulded for the duties of after life. Moreover, according to Mr. Dale's report, the National schools taught by nuns are, not only more efficient than other National

¶ Page 71.

schools, but they are much cheaper also; and, according to the statistics compiled by the Archbishop of Dublin, they are more efficient than even the Model schools which, only 28 in number exclusive of the Central Model school, cost £500,000 to build and equip, and £31,316 7s. 2d. a year to work. With those facts before me I am at a loss to know how the teaching of nuns is "educationally injurious." Not surely because their teaching is better than that of others. Then it is the "competition?" But I should have thought that the "economic sense" would above all look for educational results, would consider public rather than personal interest, and would assume that the teachers are for the pupils, not the pupils for the teachers; would prefer teachers who educate at a cost to the State of £1 17s. 11½d. per child, to teachers who educate at a cost to the State of £2 8s. 5d. per child with inferior educational results.

I now pass on to nuns who nurse; and I think it is the conviction of those who best know, that workhouses and hospitals under the care of nuns are managed best as to efficiency and economy. I believe that is the opinion of medical men and of Poor Law Guardians.

In *The Hospital*, a very interesting medical review published in London, a series of articles on the nursing question in Paris appeared during 1898. They were written by Sir Edmund Spearman, who described in detail the gradual laicisation of the Parisian hospitals, which change, according to him, has not been an improvement. In the same review for October, 1903, an account is given of the nursing as carried on in the Paris Municipal School of Nursing which began in 1878, the first move in the process of laicising the hospitals. In the same number an account is given of the nursing as it is done in the Hospital of St. John and St. Elizabeth in

London, which is in charge of the Sisters of Mercy, and depends on private donations. An editorial in the same number says of the laicised system in Paris:—"It will be seen that the condition of affairs is at present far from satisfactory. Certificates, it is true, are insisted on by the municipality before the nurses can be promoted, but as these are often granted at the end of a single year, and can be earned either by a nurse in the wards, or a woman who studies in her own home, and has never seen a patient, their value is obviously small, and necessarily may be a source of serious danger to the public. Contrasting this system with that which is described by our Commissioner as prevailing at the Hospital of St. John and St. Elizabeth in London, it must be acknowledged that the advantage lies with the nun who has received hospital training rather than with the half-trained, but certificated, French lay nurse." Some persons insist that the only security for good nursing is the hall-mark of a government or a municipality. Those observations I have just quoted, at any rate, dispose one to doubt or to discount the value of certificates approved by government or by municipal authority. Some time ago the nuns were expelled also from the hospitals of Marseilles, and were replaced by certificated lay nurses. The doctors and the patients protested, but in vain. The nuns' substitutes, however, in spite of the certificates, did not prove satisfactory. About a year ago their services were dispensed with, and the nuns were invited to take their place once more in the hospitals.

It was said to me a few years ago by a lady that it is unfair for nuns to usurp the province of lady nurses who want to make a living. My answer was, in substance, this:—Whose province? What native right has the lady living in the world to nurse, which may not be equally claimed by the lady who becomes a nun But the lady nurse has to make her living? Well, if we are to think

out the question on these lines, has not the lady who becomes a nun to make her living? Or is a lady, once she becomes a nun, supposed henceforth to live on the wind? If you and a few other ladies wish to join in a private nursing establishment, you claim a perfect right to do so. Very well; and if you, after a time, determine to form a permanent association for nursing, and bind yourselves by religious vows, by what process do you lose the right which you had before?

A century ago, when the Catholic poor of Ireland had to remain for the most part untaught unless they consented to be educated on the condition or the risk of proselytism, a young Cork lady set about providing for the education of the poor of her native city. There was nothing wrong, I suppose, in her doing so. Well, she got other ladies to co-operate with her. It was, I suppose, a truly philanthropic work. They worked under the patronage of Dr. Moylan, Bishop of Cork, finally formed themselves into a permanent society by taking religious vows, and are known as the Presentation Nuns. If the work which Miss Nagle and her first associates undertook was a good one, it was wise of them to secure that it would live after them. When they took religious vows, how did they thereby lose any right to teach, which they had before? Was their competition with lay teachers "excessive and educationally injurious," then? If so, there was nothing to prevent others, without taking vows, from supplying the want which they sought to supply? Why did others not do so? There were neither critics nor complaints about convent competition in those days, because there were no government grants. A generation passed on, and another lady began a similar educational work in Dublin. She found other ladies to associate with her. They also taught poor schools as a society; and still a want remained in the education of the poor, which any ladies who desired

might have helped to supply. But how many did so, besides those who became nuns? After some time, Miss Macauley and her associates, to secure the permanence of their society and their work, took religious vows, and are known as the Sisters of Mercy. Those two congregations of ladies soon spread over Ireland and, in time, over England, Australia, and America. They taught the poor in Ireland without receiving a penny of public money for the building of their schools or as remuneration for their work. It passes my understanding how they have not the same right to teach to-day, when the public rewards them for their work, which they had in those days when there was no public remuneration, and therefore no critics to complain of their work or to envy them the privilege of doing it; especially since, according to official testimony, they do their work more efficiently than others, and at less cost to the public. Oh! in those days they were freely allowed to tread the wine-press alone. But in those days there was no government recognition of their work. In these days they receive a capitation grant for teaching from the National Board —considerably less no doubt than lay teachers receive— but still a grant of public money. Thus the times are changed, and we have changed with them in more senses than one. Hence the new-born zeal for the education of the people. Hence the jealousy, the criticism, the complaint, and the calumny. Why should nuns dare to teach?—That was not said till recent years. Why should they usurp the province of ladies who want to make a living?—That was not thought of when Miss Nagle, Miss Macauley, and their early associates, out of the fulness of their Catholic charity, began their work, and when there was a vast field of labour for any who had the will to do it. Why should they receive public remuneration for teaching? What right have they to

receive any share of the public taxes for doing a public work? This right—They have been born and bred in Ireland like others; have as much right to live in Ireland as others have; and, since Sir Horace's standpoint forces me to discuss whether their presence is "economically unsound;" they have as much right to work for their living in this land of their birth as others have. One would think that nuns are some foreign importations blown into the country as exotics by some adverse breezes. A young lady has been born on Irish soil, of Irish parents, and because, when she comes to choose a line of life, she chooses to become a nun, she is not let use that common civil right without having to bear the criminatory impertinences of those especially who are in Ireland but not of it!

Sir Horace has "no doubt at all that their competition with lay teachers is excessive and educationally injurious." If they were not bound by religious vows, but were simply ladies associated in the work of teaching, would their presence or their multiplication be "economically unsound" and "educationally injurious?" If any dozen ladies associated for similar work, would he pass a similar criticism on their action? If he would, I should like to know on what grounds, and I should look out for their reply with much interest. Rings, trusts, syndicates, and companies of all sorts arise, increase, and multiply, and the economist acknowledging them as economic factors provides a place for each in the parallelogram of economic forces. Creameries or co-operative stores may multiply over the land, and although they may swallow up the small shopkeeper or farmer, although they have unquestionably been the occasion of having drinking centres multiplied in the country, although they have also lessened the demand for labour, and have thus, unlike the passing of cross-roads dancing, become a real cause of emigration, Sir Horace is not only their cham-

pion and their propagandist, he is their father and their prophet. *Ego non invideo, miror magis.* But then, on what principle of consistency does he attack the multiplication of teaching associations such as nuns? Is it because they are associations, or is it because they are associations bound by religious vows? The former would be contradictory, the latter would be bigotry.

The buildings belonging to those two congregations are amongst "the costly and elaborate monastic and conventual institutions, involving what, in the aggregate, must be an enormous annual expenditure" to which he finds "it difficult to reconcile to the known conditions of the country." Now, we are told by Mr. Dale that the working of their schools costs considerably less to the public than the other similar schools; I know from personal knowledge that they help the poorer pupils to a large extent in the way of food and clothes; and their income is spent in the locality of their work, and not in London or the Riviera. What he condemns, then, is not true of the work they do. Is it true of the school-houses where they teach, or of the convents where they live? The buildings which belong to them in the city where I am writing are amongst the largest in the country; and I speak of these only, since, unlike the convent critics who speak as knowing everything about every convent in the country, I have no definite knowledge of any outside the place where I live. The principal convent of the Sisters of Mercy in Limerick is St. Mary's. It is built beside the ruins of the old Dominican Abbey, and accommodates about 50 nuns who do the internal work of the establishment, visit the sick and poor daily, and take charge of schools in which over 2,000 children are taught. Their conventual buildings on this spot consist of the convent, a house of refuge for servants out of place, and splendid schools for over 1,000 children. Not a penny of public money has ever

been spent on any of those buildings. Ah! you Roman casuist; but have they not been built by public subscription made in the city or its surroundings? No, they have not. About thirty years ago a bazaar was, I am told, held to enlarge the convent chapel, and a few benefactors, who had relatives in the community, made gifts of an altar and windows. For the rest, no public subscription of any kind has ever been asked or given to meet the cost of those buildings. In charge of the same community are schools beside the cathedral some distance away—a fine block of buildings in which also more than 1,000 children are taught. The building was raised at the sole expense of a Limerick physician, Dr. Frith, who, I suppose, had a perfect right to turn his own money to such a use without consulting any economists. Attached to it is a school for boys, which was paid for by the nuns themselves, supplemented by a grant from the National Board. Where, then, did the cost of all these buildings come from? It is an impertinent question for me to ask; but I answer, it came from the dowries of the Sisters, and from savings made from the grants allowed them by the Commissioners for teaching. That is, besides their dowries, they give part of the capitation grant which they get for teaching, to build their schools. I know, on reliable authority, that owing to such outlay they were once brought to great straits till Bishop Ryan, who, from living very simply during a long episcopate of forty years, saved a considerable sum of money, knowing their needs, left them a large portion of his savings for their personal support.

The Presentation Nuns have charge of schools in which more than 1,000 children are taught. The oldest part of their convent was built seventy years ago by a parish priest in the city. He was architect and clerk of works, paid for the work out of the savings of a lifetime, and was himself buried by public subscription. Later

wings and a chapel have since been added mostly at the expense of the nuns themselves. But a few benefactors helped, including Bishop Ryan, who distributed between this and other such works what remained after what he had given to the Sisters of Mercy. Their schools also were originally built by Father Hogan, the parish priest to whom I have just referred, at his own expense and under his own superintendence. They were then unpretentious buildings, so different from what they are now; and all that has been added to them has been done at the expense of the nuns themselves, excepting a supplementary grant from the Commissioners for a new wing recently constructed. With regard to those building grants from the Commissioners which the Presentation Nuns and the Sisters of Mercy received, they are not special favours given to nuns. They are given towards all National Schools. Those nuns have built almost all their schools; those Government Grants have helped them only to add a few wings to buildings already made, and even for the building and equipment of those few wings the nuns have paid at least half the cost.

Within the past few years the Sisters of Mercy have built a magnificent Training School, in which about 100 teachers are educated. It has not cost the city a penny to build, whilst not only the outlay on the building has been distributed in the city, but the maintenance of the institution, like the other conventual establishments, brings the city a large annual revenue. I can say, on the best authority, that its maintenance alone leaves £3,000 a year to the city. The nuns themselves have borne all the cost of the building. They have appealed to Government for help to pay the debt incurred by the cost; but, so far, the representatives of Government in Ireland have refused, although the College is doing the same work as the Training

College under the Commissioners' control in Dublin, on which £113,358 of public money was originally spent to build and furnish, and on which £50,000 is now voted out of the Irish Development Fund for buildings in connection with the same College. The Sisters of Mercy have another establishment in Limerick which began as an orphanage, was enlarged after a time, and is now used also as an Industrial School. In this they now bring up about fifty orphans partly at their own expense, and partly with funds left for that purpose, especially by two benefactors; in it also they teach over 100 children under the National Board. The Sisters began that splendid cluster of buildings with one half-crown which a poor woman came one day many years ago to offer them as a help for the support of the few orphans whom they had taken under their care. I am told that a diocesan collection was made for the extension of its humble beginning; but the greater part of the cost was borne by the nuns themselves, and by about a score of benefactors, most of whom were priests. From this community is taught another school some distance away of over 500 children, which was originally built in part by the St. Vincent de Paul Society, and enlarged at the expense of the nuns with the help of a grant from the Commissioners. Some years ago the Sisters of Mercy received a Church collection through the city for their orphanage, but on receiving a considerable sum by bequest they ceased to appeal to the people for help. At present they receive an annual Church collection in the city for the maintenance of their House of Refuge and the relief of the poor. One who was their chaplain some years ago tells me that this collection makes about £100. They also receive an annual grant for the same purpose from a wealthy and beneficent lady who is interested in the work. But, considering that they have about 40 servants usually in the House of

Refuge, and that two nuns from each of their two city convents go daily amongst the poor, I was not surprised to learn also from the same source that they spend in those two works about £1,000 a year. The Presentation Nuns also have an annual city collection to provide the poorest of their school children with food and clothes. That collection, which comes to about the same as that received by the Sisters of Mercy is, I have reason to know, only a small part of what they spend in various ways on the poor in the course of the year.. Besides these works, four Sisters of Mercy are engaged in nursing the sick poor in their homes without a penny cost to the city; they do it all at their own expense.

Let us now stop to reflect a little. Nearly 4,000 children are educated in all those schools which I have considered. They are usually marked "excellent" by the School Inspectors, and I believe that some of them never fail to get that distinction. According to Mr. Dale they are superior, and yet cost much less than other National Schools. Excepting a small fraction of their cost, all those buildings have been erected from time to time within the past seventy years without an appeal to the public taxes or to a local public subscription. If it be true of any in Ireland, it is true of them that they are "costly and elaborate institutions, involving what must be an enormous annual expenditure for maintenance," which "it is difficult to reconcile with the known conditions of the country." Now, let us suppose that Sir Horace and the Department set about providing equally fine school buildings and excellent teaching for 4,000 children, how would he set about doing it at less, or at as little, cost to the public? On the contrary, he would have to dive deeply into the public purse. Why, the salary which, let us say, himself and Dr. Starkie receive in one year from the public funds is considerably more than all those buildings for the school accommo-

dation of those 4,000 children have cost the public. Sir Horace is paid to administer the Department, Dr. Starkie is paid to administer the National System of Education; neither of them is paid to bloom into critics of public affairs, but simply to attend to the work they are paid to do. To have thus misunderstood their position is the fundamental blunder each of the two has made. The public must be the judge as to how far I have succeeded in exposing the ignorance each has betrayed of his own proper functions, in the course of his excursions into what is the business of neither. Let him pass judgment on himself, then, by his own standard, "the economic sense," which he says is shocked by the multiplication of those conventual institutions in Ireland. What justification—what appearance even of justification—can he pretend to have, in face of those facts I have given, for making against conventual institutions the charge he has made? There are about 100 members in those two communities which I have been discussing. Looking at the facts I have given straight in the face, and I defy contradiction as to them, can he find any hundred ladies living outside religious communities who would do as much work for the public at ten times the public expense? And yet they "shock the economic sense!" Those facts I have given prove, beyond doubt or suspicion, that the position of aggressiveness towards convents which he has taken up is a false one; and even though it were well-founded it would be unbecoming, because, were those institutions ever so extravagant it would badly become him to complain, since neither he nor his have been asked to share the burden of their cost. But our economic critics evidently have not yet exorcised themselves of the feeling that it is their privilege to pry into our account books and into our cash boxes even when we are spending our own. Usurped prerogatives die slowly. But

they die; and the sooner our critics let them go the better. We forgive past injustice, but we shall not tolerate present insolence.

In connection with the Good Shepherd Convent in Limerick, there are five distinct establishments, forming a cluster of buildings—the Convent itself, the Penitents' House, the Industrial School, the Reformatory School, and a house for girls out of employment. When the nuns came to Limerick, nearly 60 years ago, part of the land now enclosed within the Convent grounds was a bog not quite disused, to raise and level which mud had to be carted from the road close by. The old part of the Convent cost £7,000, of which the nuns themselves became responsible for £4,000. The late Dr. O'Shaughnessy contributed £1,000, and the rest was subscribed by some benefactors. Within the last ten years a new and imposing building was added, the whole burden of which the nuns themselves have borne with the exception of £87. The Penitents' House was built partly at their own expense, but mostly through bazaars and by the subscriptions of some benefactors, including Bishop Ryan, Bishop Butler, bequests from many priests, Dr. Frith, Dr. Geary, Mr. Murtagh O'Brien, a wealthy clothier, and Dr. O'Shaughnessy, who contributed £1,000. I take sincere pleasure in making this memorial of the last-named gentleman, "The Doctor," as he was commonly called; one of the most lovable men I have ever known. He died just two years ago at the age of 93, with his intellect as clear as it was in his early manhood; and not many days before his death he went about the city and visited the homes of the poor with a step as light as one only half his age. The morning he died he was in communication with the magistrates about the committal of a few destitute children to an Industrial School, and he was able, from his death-bed, to make known the success of his communication to their widowed mother

twenty minutes before he departed. Besides other donations he also contributed towards fitting up the house used for girls out of employment; took a great interest generally in the work of the Good Shepherd nuns, and was the most munificent benefactor they have ever had. He contributed very largely also towards the Industrial School for boys under the charge of the Christian Brothers, and towards other works of charity in the city. But he did more than give largely of his money in the interest of the poor—he gave all his time. Till not many days before his death he was one of the most active members of the St. Vincent de Paul Society. He was a man of exceptional ability; he knew the value of money well; and if an economist came and told him that he was misusing his money or his time on these works of charity on which he had set his heart, the charming play of his wit in reply to his critic would be very interesting. Those who knew him well can easily make a picture of it, and how the worldly wise economist would retire a sadder and a wiser man.

The Industrial School cost £9,000, which expense has been borne by the nuns themselves except about £500 received from a few benefactors. The Reformatory School cost £4,000, which expense has also been borne by the nuns, except about £700, of which £600 was given by one who is living still, and who would, I know, be displeased if I mentioned his name. Within the last few years they have spent over £2,000 on necessary improvements on the Penitents' institution, for which they themselves have also become responsible, except about £800, the result of a bazaar. Besides money paid originally for the ground they pay about £200 a year in rent; they also pay, I believe, borough rates and poor rates. So much for the buildings.

As to the maintenance of these institutions, the nuns receive a capitation grant for the children of the

Industrial and Reformatory Schools. But they have about 120 penitents from various parts of the country, for whose maintenance they hold themselves responsible, except about £170 a year, which they receive through an annual collection. That department is chiefly maintained by a laundry. Besides these they have about 90 children under their charge, for whose support they provide without any outside help. Will any economist get so much work done through the same number of ladies without a religious community at so little cost to the public as to buildings and as to maintenance? And yet if any Convent critic saw that splendid pile of buildings without knowing the facts of the case which I have in part stated, they would be sure to "shock his economic sense." Instead of depleting the city of money, as Sir Horace would have us believe, the maintenance of so large an establishment brings a large annual revenue to it, over and above the distribution for labour of the money which the building cost. The three ladies who are at the head of those three communities of which I have specifically written—the Sisters of Mercy, the Presentation and the Good Shepherd Nuns—arrange with architects and contractors, and make a general supervision over any buildings in course of erection for them. An experienced clerk of works, speaking recently of one of them, said that he has never met a person not in the building trade who understood the details of a building better. I hope for the sake of the public purse that the New College of Science in Dublin, which is being built by the Department, will bear witness to as much ability and economy as these conventual establishments of which I have just written. Rev. Mothers are not the witless pietists their economic critics seem to take them for; they know more than their prayers.

As I have dealt with the economics of the Convents in the City of Limerick, I may as well complete the work,

and consider the case of all the Convents in the diocese. The Reparation Nuns and the Faithful Companions come under the general statement I have already made about communities engaged in works of a private nature. I have reviewed the economic position of the Good Shepherd, the Presentation Nuns, and the Sisters of Mercy. Besides the works already mentioned on which the Sisters of Mercy are engaged, they also have charge of the workhouse hospital. Ten Sisters are paid £20 a year each out of the rates for their services there. But the community gives the services of thirteen Sisters instead of ten—all for £200 a year; and the thirteen have to support themselves out of that sum, which, of course, has to be supplemented out of the funds of the community itself. I do not mention this at all in complaint against the Poor Law Guardians, who would probably give more if they were asked. The Sisters, as far as I know, are satisfied to continue their work of charity for that allowance. I refer to it merely for the purpose of giving an opportunity to economists to consider whether they could, through lady nurses not living in religious community, get the same work done, and as efficiently, at three times the cost. The economist will say:—Oh; but if these nuns did not undertake that work it should be given to ladies who live by nursing; and although it would be more expensive those lady nurses would have a livelihood. I see, then, the standpoint of the Convent critic who would excommunicate nuns in the name of economics. It is that nurses in workhouses are not for the sake of the sick poor who are sheltered there, but that the sick poor are for the sake of nurses who want to make a living. But, being only a Catholic, whose religion is uneconomic, I have thought that the doctors, nurses, masters, and all workhouse officials are for the sake of the poor, in whose interest the people pay rates which they elect Guardians to

administer without waste, and consequently that the Guardians carry out the will of the people best when they get the work done best at least cost.

The Sisters of Mercy, besides those houses I have mentioned, have branch houses in Adare, Rathkeale, Newcastle West, and Glin. Let us consider their share in the "enormous annual expenditure for maintenance" which "is difficult to reconcile with the known conditions of the country." In Adare there are six nuns, some engaged in the Convent and some in teaching under the National Board. The late Lord Dunraven built the Convent for them, and endowed it with £50 a year, which the present Earl pays. An economist would, of course, think that the late Earl, having been a convert to the Catholic Church, had lost "the economic sense;" but I suppose that his Lordship thought otherwise, and he did as he thought best with his own.

The Sisters of Mercy were established in Rathkeale fifty-five years ago. Father Walsh, the parish priest, gave his house to them for a Convent, and bequeathed £1,200 to build schools. About twenty-five years ago when the new church had been built, the old one was turned into schools; and the cost of the alteration was met partly by a bazaar, partly by a parish collection which amounted to £100; but chiefly by a legacy left by Archdeacon Halpin, P.P., and by the nuns themselves. The school is under the National Board. Beside the Convent is a small orphanage, originally built for a residence by Archdeacon Fitzgerald, in which fourteen orphan girls are maintained at the sole expense of the nuns.

They were established in Newcastle West in the forties. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to relate that the ground on which their Convent and schools are built was given up in their favour by Parson Locke, who held it in tenancy from the Earl of Devon. Till

that time there was only a mixed school in the town, which was specially inconvenient in those days when grown boys and girls went to school. The parson, who was a magistrate also, knew well the need of a separate female school, and he generously consented on the suggestion of one of the priests to resign his tenancy of a few acres beside the town with a view to bringing the Sisters of Mercy from Limerick to open a school for girls. Dean Coll, the parish priest, laid the case before a conference of the priests of that part of the diocese, and between them they subscribed £700 towards the work. Bishop Ryan also subscribed, a few of the parishioners, and a priest of an adjoining parish left £100 at his death to pay off the debt on the Convent and Schools. The nuns themselves did the rest. They pay £18 or £19 rent to the Earl of Devon for the five acres, the tenancy of which was passed over to them by Parson Locke; but on the other hand, the Earl with characteristic generosity gives them £20 a year for the poor; and Wm. Smith O'Brien used to give them £5 a year for the same object, but I cannot say whether it goes on still. Their schools are under the National Board, from which they receive a capitation grant for teaching. Attached to the Convent is an orphanage in which they maintain and educate about 20 orphan girls at their own expense. They have also a technical school in which they teach lace and shirt-making to about 20 girls from the town, who, when they are trained, are paid for their work by the nuns. They have charge also of the Newcastle West Workhouse. Two of them are paid £30 a year each, out of which they have to support themselves; but four nuns give their services besides the two who are paid; so that the poor have the service of six nuns for £60 a year. I should say that the Guardians of the Newcastle Union must have "the economic sense" to manage such a bargain as that. I

do not think that the Department could get the work done so efficiently and economically without the aid of a religious community.

At Glin they have charge of the Workhouse school. Five are paid £250 a year; but the community give the services of two more for nothing. The Very Rev. Dr. Shanahan, V.G., when he was parish priest of Ballingarry, built a parochial house after he had built two churches, but after a short residence he gave it over to the Sisters of Mercy at about one-third what it cost him, and repaired for his own use another house over 200 years old. The Sisters of Mercy have also a Convent and Schools in Abbeyfeale, and have charge of the Workhouse in Kilmallock. The Little Company of Mary have charge of St. John's Hospital, in Limerick, and take private nursing besides. The Sisters of St. Paul have recently taken charge of the Female National School at Kilfinane. They have been brought there on the insistant request of the people.

I have now given a general statement of the economic position of the Conventual establishments of the diocese of Limerick. The nuns have erected all those buildings almost entirely at their own expense, and without any expense whatever to the general public; they do the work in which they are engaged far cheaper than any other ladies would do it, and according to official returns they do it more efficiently; and besides all that they pay borough rates and poor rates just as occupiers who have never done anything except for themselves. So far from being an enormous expense to the city and county, so far from being an expense at all, they have brought an enormous revenue, especially to the city. On the face of these facts, will Sir Horace persist in publishing to the world that the actual position of Conventual establishments in Ireland is "economically unsound" and irreconcileable "with the known

conditions of the country?" I challenge contradiction as to my statements; if I am challenged perhaps I may make the case for the nuns more overwhelming. I have dealt only with the Conventual establishments of the diocese of Limerick; I know nothing about them in other dioceses, but I assume the case of Limerick to be an average example.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE NUNS AND TECHNICAL TRAINING.

I NOW propose to make a summary review of some of the industrial and technical work which nuns have been doing in Ireland.

Foxford is a village in the northern part of Co. Mayo, not far from the shore of Lough Conn. Economists and statesmen have occupied themselves from time to time with the problem of relieving the poverty of the village and the district. The cure for economic congestion is to relieve the congested district of its surplus population. Foxford was labelled by economists a "congested district." Then apply the prescription, and the cure is complete. Hence the emigration schemes of Mr. Tuke, Goldwin Smith, besides others who, if they had not more sense, should at least have more sympathy with a people who were the victims not of nature but of man. That economic cure was as simple as misunderstanding the true meaning of congestion and shirking a plain public duty. Mr. Balfour later on went to see the place for himself, saw the need of some remedy, and established temporary relief work in the meantime. But temporary relief is but temporary patchwork. No remedy will effect a permanent cure for a social or economic evil unless one which has in itself what I may call the potential energy of permanent productiveness. But the blood-letting therapeutics of the economic surgeons and the temporary relief given by Mr. Balfour's more humane method had left the condition of Foxford as it was. There was the disease, as patent, painful, and destructive as ever.

Now, to adopt Sir Horace's economic distinction, there remained two sections of the people—the "productive class" who produce, and the "unproductive class" who consume, but who neither sow nor spin. The former would include, I suppose, the wealthy landlords of the country, capitalists, economists, and statesmen; the latter would include those who retire to convents from the battle of life, the actual position of whose institutions can hardly be "reconciled with the known conditions of the country." Here then was a spacious field of labour for the economic insight and the philanthropy of all—convents and convent critics. And the work appealed to the latter more than to the former, since, as we are told, they alone know how to do it thoroughly, and they claim the exclusive right to do such work whenever it promises to be productive of salaries.

There was the River Moy washing the village with its rapid waters as it flowed idly into Killala Bay. Foxford and the whole district of Kinnemany was a picture of poverty, helplessness, and hopelessness. The Hon. Emily Lawless, in one of her novels, paints a disheartening picture of the "indifference to squalor—rather the admission of it—in peasant Ireland" generally. She made her notes, made her book, went her way and sold it; but Burren, whence she got her model, remained where it was, and as it was for all she and similar critics cared. "When all is said, however," she writes, "we must leave the ill to work its own cure. National idiosyncracies are hard things to mend, and exceedingly awkward things to meddle with." When she had said that she had said all she wanted to say or meant to do. Many others have told us the same story in interviews, magazines, and books, as if we had never known of it till the theoretic philanthropists came "to see for themselves," and then went to tell the public what they saw.

In 1891 the Sisters of Charity were brought to Foxford

by the Bishop of Achonry, and, according to a writer in *The Daily Chronicle*,* this is what they found there:— "The country is dreary, the earth dark, sodden with rain as if it never had time to dry between one shower and another, and covered with boulders that offer an almost insurmountable obstacle to cultivation. The resident gentry are few, and apparently indifferent for the most part to the condition of the people so long as rents are paid. To pay these rents the men usually migrate to England for the summer and autumn, and find work with farmers, leaving their wives and children to garner as best they may their miserable harvest. With the month of November sets in a period of winter idleness, no labour to do, and no market for it if done." The Sisters turned a large barn into a schoolhouse, spent their ingenuity in getting in the children, for though the district is very populous they came very irregularly owing to poverty and distance. In a short time the daily attendance had increased so much that school room had to be extended. There are now nearly 250 girls in average attendance. As the education of the children went on, Mrs. Morrogh Bernard, the superioress, looked forward into the future, and asked herself this practical question, which, by the way, the economists of the Department do not seem to have seriously considered whilst they have been dispersing itinerant technical teachers over the country—what is to become of these children when they grow up and have learned all we will have taught them? Are time and money to be spent in training them for the benefit of the foreign countries whither they are sure to go for want of a way of living here? And the answer she made to herself was not to "leave the ill to work out its own cure," nor did she inconsiderately set down its cause to "national idiosyncracies," and take no pains to consider a cure. Miss Bremner, an English non-Catholic

* Feb., 1897.

visitor, thus describes her answer in the *Educational Times** :—"Walking in the Community garden, the foaming Moy (Mary's river) always sounded in her ears, 'Try me, try me,' it said quite plainly. What could it do, all this water power running to waste? It could turn a saw-mill, but there was little timber. It could supply motor power for a mill of some kind. Since the neighbourhood is agricultural, supporting a large number of sheep, why not buy their wool from the farmers, start a woollen factory, and sell woven goods? The Rev. Mother mentioned the idea to a few people, and they douched it well with cold water. A very likely thing that nuns—women who are, and always have been, mere babes in knowledge of the world—could buy wool, manage a mill, when labour is so difficult to control nowadays, sell in the right markets. The good Mother and her senses must have parted company to think of it for a moment. . . . Clouds, opposition, difficulties, arose on every side, but still Mother Bernard's faith made her calmly say—'It is God's work; He *must* help His people.' The general opinion was that the nuns were fools, and the feeling of being opposed did not make the task of these gentle women more easy. There is no need to lengthen the story. The Divine Providence Factory has been a great success. It has been extended again and again till it bids fair to swallow up the Convent Garden; it is still far from an imposing building. It is £17,000 in debt, but then it has brought work and wages to more than a hundred people, and has caused comparative wealth to flow into Foxford. There are numbers of workers who earn 15s. or 20s. a week, and that means wealth. Last year £2,600 was spent in the purchase of wool in the neighbourhood. They make blankets, travelling rugs, flannels, shawls, serges, tweeds, friezes, and other woollen stuffs. Their goods cannot be called low-priced, but

* April, 1899.

those who like a good article for their money will not consider them dear. The nuns have an annual turn-over of between £8,000 and £9,000." The nuns began the factory in the autumn of 1894, and what I have just quoted from Miss Bremner is only part of the change effected in less than five years. In 1894 there was not a butcher's shop in Foxford; in 1897 there were three. There are more than 1,000 families in the district making a radius of five miles around Foxford, nearly all occupiers of plots of land, or rather rocks, of a few acres in extent. In 1894 there was a manure heap before every door, and their live stock were installed in the kitchen; to-day hardly a manure heap is to be seen before a cabin door in all Kinnemany; flower beds have supplanted them; the chattels no longer lodge with their masters, but occupy houses of their own; several of the cottiers have planted orchards, and nearly all the district is dotted over with chestnuts, sycamores, firs, and poplars. I again call Miss Bremner to witness:—"In the Sisters' garden you will also find another branch of technical work—a co-operative creamery. People come and sell their milk to the creamery, obtaining ready cash in exchange. At first they were distrustful, and eyed the thing askance; the Sisters lost on the venture, because in their desire to do good they gave too big a price. But now it is an acknowledged success. There is a constant coming and going of small children with milk cans. The milk is made into excellent butter, and since the best and most recent machinery is used, the creamery affords an object-lesson in dairy work. One skilled dairy woman, with three or four learners, is constantly engaged in the dairy work. A third branch of the nuns' organisation of Foxford labour is a large workroom where various employments are taught and carried on. A number of girls are busy shirt-making, several sewing-machines being in use. There are a dozen knitting-machines which turn out large

numbers of stockings. Here is a girl busy making quilts out of waste woollen fluff, which is encased in the same way as eider-down. Sister Hickey is in charge of this department, and it is popularly believed that however extraordinary a thing is demanded from the work-room the Sister will find some way of supplying the demand. A number of young girls—farmers' daughters—work in this room, in the dairy, or are pupil teachers in the day school. For these board and lodging is provided by the Community at a moderate figure."

Such is the transformation wrought in forlorn Foxford in less than five years. The improvement has progressed during the past six years, and is going on now. The change appears all the stranger when we know that it has come without initiative or aid from either magazine writers or draft-scheme economists. Even the Department was not called into synod, for it did not yet exist. It is all due to the initiative and energy of a few nuns who rise at five o'clock in the morning, begin the day with about two hours at meditation and Mass, repress their individuality for the rest of the day by complete obedience to a Rev. Mother, and have committed themselves by vow to the life-long foolishness of "shifting the human centre of gravity to a future existence." The Congested Districts Board gave them a gift of £1,500, and a loan of £7,000, to begin the work, and they borrowed about £7,000 more from other sources. With those loans, which they are paying back by degrees, they have practised their economics on Foxford, and have tested the truth of the "national idiosyncracy" theory of theoretical altruists. It is not my purpose to consider the work of those nuns more in detail; but what I have said gives me the right to ask Sir Horace if he can point to a single instance in which the Department, with its ample supply of public money, with its highly-salaried experts and professional economists, has wrought such a transformation in any district

in Ireland as those dozen ladies of the "unproductive classes" have made in Kinnemany? Economists and experts of the Departmcnt! you have plenty money at your disposal, yet you have nowhere in Ireland done such a work as that. It is time for the public to ask, why? Is it because you do not know how to do it? or is it because you do not take the trouble to do it? There are many districts in Ireland at present as Foxford was eleven years ago. Allowing you the vast advantage of the public money which you control, so unlike Sister Bernard who, with her community, has had to work mostly with money borrowed, and with principal and interest weighing them down, will you take up any of those deserted districts and show us in a few years such a change made by you as that which the Sisters of Charity have made in Kinnemany? But if that does not come within the functions of the Department—and if it does not I do not know what does—can you get any dozen ladies, with money or family influence at their back, living in the world, and acquainted with its needs and ways, who will face such a task, and work a transformation such as that which has been made by those nuns of whose incapacity you write by implication:—"I personally do not think that teachers who have renounced the world and withdrawn from contact with its stress and strain are the best moulders of the characters of youths who will have to come in direct conflict with the trials and temptations of life?" If bishops should invite other communities of nuns to establish convents in the midst of those places, and if they succeed, as they have succeeded elsewhere, in bringing brightness and life to where there was desolation and death, will you see in their presence also only an increasing "multiplication of costly and elaborate conventual institutions" which "is difficult to reconcile with the known conditions of the country?" And may economists of a generation hence com-

plain that the Foxford nuns have usurped a work which secular ladies would be glad to do, and could do better? But the first thing necessary to do a work is to be willing to do it, and the best proof of being able to do it is to have done it. And as it is with women, so it is with men. Amongst the most unbusiness-like men I have known have been those who call themselves "men of business;" they are often the Captain Bobadils and the militia-men of industry. It is often those of them who have never proved their work by doing it, or even by trying to do it, who prattle most platitudes about "the battle of life," and about the need and the way of training the youth of both sexes how to fight it.

The Youghal Needle Lace Industry began in 1847. Whilst Government statesmen were disowning their duty by ignoring the famine which was actually ravaging Ireland; whilst economists were pauperising the people with doles of relief, though enough food to feed them was grown in the country, but was being shipped from its shores; whilst the accredited agents of the economic religion were wasting money and time in trying to persuade them that an unstinted supply of bread and beef is the best test of evangelical truth, the Presentation Nuns, feeling the famine around them, tried another and a better way to fight it in Youghal. There was in the Convent a piece of old Italian lace, which suggested to one of the nuns, Sister Mary Anne Smyth, that she might make one like it. She examined the stitches as she cautiously took the piece asunder, and reproduced the model. She then taught the secret to the girls in the school and in the town who showed an aptitude for such work. That was the beginning of the Youghal Lace School and Industry which, in spite of many a hard struggle, has, through the care of the nuns, been kept alive without a breakdown to this day. She soon had 120 girls at work, and was able to pay them about £2,000 wages in one year.

Some years ago they started a Crochet Industry at the request of a French merchant who came over from Paris for the purpose of inducing them to supply him with such work. They now employ about 200 crochet-workers. But the Lace Industry is the one to which they are most attached. The nuns and the workers are bound to it, not only for the employment that it gives, but by the tie of affection and a praiseworthy pride. In many cases the mothers, and, in some cases, the grandmothers, of the school-children are to be seen working in the lace-room every day—old women who learned the art when it was in its childhood like themselves, and have never forsaken it. Very few girls who learn lace-work in Youghal ever emigrate, and some of those who have done so have come back again.

This Lace Industry—although created and promoted to success by the skill and care of the nuns—has been given over by them to the ownership of the workers. Some years ago they turned it into a Co-operative Society, and since then the workers share the profits, such as they are, as well as receive the wages of their work. But the nuns still manage the business, find a market, pay the wages, distribute the profits, keep accounts, and supply the designs. The co-operative system has been adopted also by the nuns at Gort, Carrick-on-Suir, Carrickmacross, and several other places through the country. Why those nuns have given away the ownership of industries made by their own skill and at their own cost, I do not know, unless it be that they wished to perfect the purpose of charity, which was their prime motive in creating them. If I were giving a Retreat to those nuns, and were dealing with the question on the principles of ascetics, I should judge it by the law of charity, and in the light of the evangelical counsels which nuns profess to follow. But neither I nor the economists, nor the Convent critics, nor outsiders of whatever sort, have any

claim to consider the question in that light; for as far as we are concerned we see in those industries only works begun and promoted by the nuns themselves, and which, for that reason, they have a perfect right to conduct on whatever system they please. I measure judgment to the economic critics out of their own bushel. I look at the question here in the light of economics; I judge it not by the law of charity, but by the law of commutative justice. If any other ladies had created an industry, and had spent their time and skill and money on it till they had made it a success, those critics would not dare to demand an audit of accounts, would get a rude repulse if they intruded their counsels unbidden into a business which they did not help to make.

Dat veniam corvis, vexat censura columbas

When nuns lead their own life in their own way the complaint of their critics is that they do not observe the laws of economics, and when they tread the path of economics, the complaint is that they are not led by the law of charity. But if other ladies who attempt similar industries observe either or neither, the Convent critics are satisfied, or at least are silent. They dare not do otherwise, for they know they could not criticise with impunity. It is only right to observe that, as a rule, those only complain how things are done who have never helped to do them.

I now pass on to Sligo. The Sisters of Mercy have the following industries there:—A School of Fine Needlework, Lace, Embroidery, Drawn-work, and Crochet; Hosiery, Cookery, Laundry, Dairy, Poultry, Bees. The Sewing School was started in 1880, and gives employment to about 60 workers, each of whom receives in wages sums varying from £10 to £25 a year. The Hosiery School began also in 1880, gives employment to about 12, who receive about the same wages as those in the Sewing School. The Cookery School was also started in 1880.

At this school girls are trained to be cooks and general servants; private students from the neighbourhood also attend for lessons; classes are also taught in connection with the National Board, and since 1902 in connection with the Technical Board. The Laundry School dates from 1847, and the Dairy School from 1890. Between 40 and 50 are employed in these. The pupils are boarded and lodged, and some are clothed; and besides they are paid from £8 to £10 a year. When their course of training is over, situations as laundresses or domestic servants are provided for them; and to better fit them for the future they are also trained in poultry-rearing and in bee-keeping. Until 1902 all those industries were carried on at the expense of the Sisters of Mercy, but since then the nuns receive some help from the Technical Board for the Sewing, Hosiery, and Cookery Schools. Similar industries are taught at the branch houses of the Sligo Community in Roscommon, Athlone, and Summerhill, and on a smaller scale at Boyle, Elphin, and Strokestown. At Roscommon, Hosiery, Shirt-making, Lace-making, and Embroidery began to be taught in 1895. Poultry-rearing was introduced the following year, and I believe that experts consider the poultry-yard and its arrangements about the best of the kind in Ireland. Laundry, Cookery, and Dairy training have formed part of the Convent work for nearly half a century. About 30 girls on an average are employed at the Hosiery and Shirt-making Industry, and each earns about 7s. a week. About the same number are employed at the Lace-making, but their wages depend upon the amount of work they do, and on the market that is found for it. About 20 girls are engaged at the Laundry, Cookery, and Dairy work; these, for the most part, pass out as suitable vacancies offer for domestic service. It will be observed that all those industries were in existence before the Department came; they have all been organised and worked by the

Sisters of Mercy without aid from any outside source; but during the past few years the Department, I believe, supplies occasional courses of lectures.

In Ballyshannon a Shirt-making Industry was started by Canon M'Kenna about ten years ago; it gives employment to about 20 girls, who earn from 1s. 6d. to 2s. a day. A Hosiery Industry is also conducted by the Sisters of Mercy, at which 30 girls are employed, who earn about 1s. 6d. a day. The Department has refused to co-operate in either industry.

At Bundoran the Sisters of St. Louis opened a class for the teaching of Carrickmacross Lace in September, 1900. After about a year's work they received some help from the Technical Board for about a year; but for the last three years they have carried on the work with their own resources. The industry affords employment to an average of 15 girls. In the autumn of 1903 they commenced to teach the Clones Crochet-Lace, at which 17 girls on an average are employed. This industry also they have carried on at their own risk and with their own resources. They provide a market for the work, and hand over to the workers the full price they get for it.

Lace-work was first taught in Carrickmacross in the year of the Famine by a philanthropic lady for the benefit of the poor; but the work ceased in the course of time. The Convent of St. Louis, in Monaghan, established a branch house there fourteen years ago, but their work was limited to the teaching of primary and secondary schools. Meanwhile the lace-work was carried on by a lady in the Bath and Shirley School, but the workers complained, and had I believe good cause to complain of the remuneration they received for their work. In 1898 the Convent built a Technical School at their own expense, and started the Lace Industry on the co-operative system. Three years later they introduced the

Machine-knitting Industry, the Department giving a grant of £52 to defray the expense of a teacher for one year. The Department recognised one of the nuns as teacher; but as it would not supply the plant, they spent the grant, and as much more, on the purchase of the necessary machinery, although they were heavily in debt on account of the Technical School and their other teaching establishments. During the few years those industries have been in existence, the workers have received about £8,000 for their work. About 130 girls are at present employed.

I now come down South again. At New Ross the Sisters of Mercy opened a school of machine-knitting. But they soon gave it up as a hosiery factory was started in the town, which promised to give employment to those for whose benefit they had undertaken the work. The Sisters then turned their attention to Irish crochet, on which they are able to keep about 24 girls at work. At Enniscorthy they keep about 20 employed at hosiery and shirt-making.

The Sisters of Mercy in Galway keep about 20 girls employed at lace-making and at making the lower ends of trawling nets. The trawlers of the district have to get their nets from Glasgow and elsewhere. That is not as it should be in a fishing town like Galway, nor as it would be if their economic critics had imitated or even helped the nuns in their attempt to create and extend so necessary and hopeful an industry. But our Departmental economists seem to be bewildered between their draft-schemes and their army of experts who have suddenly sprung up like Athena out of the brain of Zeus, sweeping through the country in full economic panoply, sometimes advising industries for unsuitable places, as if they neglected the iron industry in the Cleveland district of Yorkshire and established it in the Golden Vale. In 1887 the Galway Sisters of Mercy

made a novel departure. They started the book-binding trade with the sole help of £20 which Bishop McCormack gave them towards initial expenses. They employ several girls at the industry, who turn out cheap and serviceable work.

In Gort the Sisters of Mercy opened a school of knitting, linen and woollen weaving, lace-making, crochet, embroidery, vestments, and altar work in 1889. They have about 50 hands at work, who each earn from 5s. to 12s. a week, according to their diligence and skill.

In Kinsale the Sisters of Mercy began a school of Limerick Lace about twenty years ago. Since then they have added Point lace, Clones, and other varieties of crochet and needlework. There are about 100 girls employed, including beginners, who earn from 10s. a week downwards.

In 1886 the Sisters of Mercy in Dungarvan started a school for machine-knitting, in which all kinds of such work are taught; and ten years later they began embroidery and sewing of every description. About a dozen girls are constantly employed, who earn from 3s. to 8s. a week. They began, and have carried on, the work out of their own resources. In Dunmanway the Sisters of Charity opened a school of domestic economy a few years ago at their own expense, but have since been helped by the County Council. The curriculum includes simple nursing, dairy-work, poultry-rearing, bee-keeping, fruit, flowers, preserves, etc. They make over £70 a year on blackberries alone. In Limerick the Sisters of Mercy, a few years ago, altered and repaired a disused schoolhouse at considerable cost for the purpose of lace-work and knitting. They carry on the work in connection with the Borough Council, keep about 50 girls employed, including learners, who earn from 15s. a week downwards. They are also taught to draw and design, and they have to spend some time each week at cooking and laundry

work. To those I add the Sisters of Mercy at Dundalk, Ardee, Cookstown, Longford, Edgeworthstown, Derry, Queenstown, Westport, Castlebar, Claremorris—the poor Clares at Ballyjamesduff, Ballyshannon, and Kenmare; the Sisters of Charity at Seville Place and Ballaghadereen; the Presentation Sisters at Cashel, Thurles, and at Kilkenny, where they started a linen factory in 1892, in order to provide employment for girls who had left their schools. I read an account of it eight or ten years ago, and at that time they had twelve looms at work, over twenty hands employed, and turned out linen articles of all descriptions. I believe that there is hardly a primary school in the country under the charge of nuns in which training of a practical or industrial nature has not always formed part of the education of the pupils.

CHAPTER XXIII.

A REVIEW OF EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

Besides expressions of like import elsewhere in his work, Sir Horace Plunkett writes*:—"I still believe that, with their unquestioned authority in religion, *and their almost equally undisputed influence on education*, the Roman Catholic clergy cannot be exonerated from some responsibility in regard to Irish character as we find it to-day." I have already considered the "character and *morale*" of Irish Catholics. I have shown that they have proved their "character and *morale*" in the most important elements and concerns of individual, family, and social life. They do not indeed manifest much "character and *morale*" in the direction of industrial activity, and I have set forth the reasons at some length. He writes in the Epilogue to the new edition of his book that some of his critics confuse "*morale* with *morals*." They do not so. The want is in himself. He writes as if he wanted to impress his readers that there is no "character and *morale*" unless along the line of industrial activity, whereas that is only one manifestation of the quality called *character*. I now proceed to consider whether the influence of the priests on education in Ireland has been almost undisputed, as he supposes.

From the Anglo-Norman invasion to the attempted "reformation" of the country the education question in Ireland was a political one only. Such interests as language, laws, manners, national ideals were involved in it. But the inhabitants of the Pale only

* Page 110.

were affected; for, even in the reign of Henry VIII., the laws made by the Parliament of the Pale were not obeyed twenty miles outside Dublin. But the year 1537 marks the beginning of a new epoch in the relations between England and Ireland. The King claimed spiritual as well as political supremacy, and the attempt to make the Irish substitute his authority for the spiritual supremacy of the Pope brought a new element into the education question. It henceforth became a politico-religious question, and it has remained so to this day.

The object, avowed or concealed, of every system of education which has been devised for the Irish people even since has been the Anglicisation of their country. The introduction of the religious element has not changed the ultimate purpose. It has been sought to Protestantise them, not so much to save their souls, as to Anglicise them. The spiritual authority assumed by Henry was wrapped up in his royal authority, as the lesser is contained in the greater, or as the means is directed to the end. However the name may be disowned, it is not easy to see how a religion can be nationalised without being Erastian. Had the attempts to Protestantise the Irish Catholics been wholly or mainly successful, Ireland should no longer be a nation, but a province, with no more national individuality than Yorkshire. The Irish in using one and the same word, Sasanach, to express Protestant and Englishman, interpret the philosophy of their history more truly and thoroughly than most of them have thought.

If we except whatever education Irish Catholics acquired by stealth, from that time to 1782 the stern alternative for them was, their faith without education, or education without their faith. An Act passed in 1665, during the reign of Charles II., fixed that alternative by law; and more stringently still, an Act passed in 1695 during the reign of William III., and another

passed in 1703 under Queen Anne. During all the 18th century the law did not suppose a Catholic to receive an education, since, as was declared officially from the bench by an Irish judge in 1758, the "law did not suppose a Papist to exist in the Kingdom, nor could they breathe without the connivance of government." Catholic education became possible in 1782, but under certain difficult and dangerous conditions. In 1793 the first Relief Act came. The clouds of persecution then began to break, and Catholics were allowed the privilege of having their own private schools at their own expense; they were also permitted to graduate in Trinity College, but without the privilege of its prizes or emoluments. Since that time several systems of education have been framed for them. But they have not been allowed to frame any public system for themselves, and they justly disown all responsibility for educational shortcomings and failures. They rightly say; let those who have framed those systems which have hitherto been tried, presuming to understand better than ourselves what system suits us best, bear the discredit of failure to which all those systems have one by one been doomed.

I propose to show that one supreme purpose runs through and is visible in every system of education which has been prescribed for us since 1537 down to the Intermediate System; only the method or the manner has changed. Anyone who carefully considers the various systems as they follow one after another in a sort of funeral procession, will notice how the methods have been fined down gradually from the open assault on faith and nationhood made by the Parish School System which was inaugurated in the sixteenth century to the National System, the Model Schools, and the Queen's Colleges in which a system of United Education professed to bind the youths of all creeds or of no creed in bonds of non-sectarian love, in the same non-sectarian

atmosphere, and under the common instruction of the same non-sectarian teachers. The most innocent countenance is proverbially the most dangerous; and the framers of this brotherly system would have Catholics forget that it provides best for those who believe least. It must, of course, thoroughly satisfy those who have no belief at all, or for whom religion is but the subjective emotion as it comes and passes. Educational secularists coolly assume that secularism is not a sect; and sitting aloft in the serene heaven they naïvely undertake the office of impartial arbitrator in composing the consciences of warring creeds by the arithmetical artifice of a religious common denominator. But what they really do is to grind the axe of their own creedless sect.

I thus roughly draw out the order of procession. First, the doctrines retained by Protestantism were to be taught, and those rejected by it as Romish excrescences on the pure Gospel were to be denounced in the schools. Next, the Bible, to which no Christian could object, was to be taught and explained by "competent" teachers. Those two having failed, Christian compassion for the illiterate condition of the Catholics would undertake to teach them how to read and write, and to bring them up as loyal and godly citizens. The idea then dawned on our educators that past failure was due to a serious oversight, inasmuch as they had been trying to teach the Papists through a language which these did not understand; and hence a new educational venture was tried, in which the Irish language was to be the language of the schools. It was to carry out that idea that a chair of Irish was founded in Trinity College; although the dons of that Institution, now that the Gaelic League has become a power in the country, tell us that patriotism, not proselytism, was the inspiration. When that system also followed the failure of its predecessors our educators declared that

"every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low, and the crooked shall become straight, and the rough ways plain." They professed to decree the doom of educational privilege by a National System of "separate religious and united secular instruction." And lastly, it is now discovered that there has been something wrong with our education all the time. It appears to Sir Horace that priests, monks, nuns, and Irish Catholics generally are largely responsible for their unpractical education and for their consequent economic condition. They have made themselves responsible, it is said, by having given a wrong direction to their systems of education—systems which, be it remembered, they have not framed, but which have been framed for and forced upon them. Their faith is to be strengthened, the national idea is to be intensified by a system which will cultivate "character and *morale*," and will generate "the civic virtues," and "those strenuous qualities" which the non-Catholics of the North have brought across the Channel. This new idea has this in common with its predecessors, that the true inspiration must still be wafted from Holyhead towards Dublin Bay.

Before I pass on to justify what I have said I pause to venture a suggestion—Perhaps, after all, the Irish people know their own mind, and can measure their own adaptability better than outsiders; perhaps, after all, it may be true that no nation can know how to educate another so well as one can educate itself. What then if, as a last resort, after those successive financial extravagances and educational failures, the Irish people were allowed to devise a system to educate themselves? At any rate, if they fail their educators will admit that the failure will have followed the best example.

I have before me a list of nearly thirty systems with objects, dates of institution, regulations, and sources of

revenue, which have been introduced into Ireland since the 16th century. But I must limit my observations to a few, and only so far as to illustrate what I have said.

By an Act passed in 1537 (28. Henry VIII.) parsons were obliged by oath and under pain of forfeiture of benefice, amongst other parochial offices in the English interest, "to keep or cause to be kept within the paroch a schole for to learne English." That is the origin of what came to be known as the Parish School system, the object of which was to promote "the English order, habit and language," and to abolish the "manner and native apparel." But little was done to carry out the scheme till the reigns of Charles, William, and Anne; and then, according to the Report of the Education Commission of 1810, "the advancement of the Protestant religion was more distinctly provided for" in them. But the Commissioners also report that in the vast majority of parishes no schools were kept, that those which did exist were not free according to the provisions of their institution, but were maintained by the fees of the pupils; and finally the Commissioners condemned them as failures.

In 1570, a system of Intermediate schools, known as the Diocesan Free Schools, was instituted by the following Act (12th Elizabeth):—"Forasmuch as the greatest number of the people of this your Majesties realm hath of long time lived in rude and barbarous states, not understanding that Almighty God hath, by His divine laws, forbidden the manifold and haynous offences, which they spare not daily and hourly to commit and perpetrate, nor that he hath by his Holy Scriptures commanded a due and humble obedience from the people to their princes and rulers; whose ignorance in these so high pointes touching their damnation, proceedeth only of lack of good bringing up of the youth of this realm, either in publique or private schooles, where

through good discipline they might be taught to avoid those loathsome and horrible errours; it may, therefore, please your Most Excellent Majestie that it be enacted, and bee it enacted by your Highnesse, with the assent of the Lords spirituall and temporall, and the Commons in this present Parliament assembled, and by the authority of the same, *That there shall be from henceforth a free schoole within every diocese of this realm of Ireland, and that the schoolmaster shall be an Englishman, or of the English birth of this realm, etc.*" That Act explains the object of those schools. But although it provides that they should be provided and maintained out of the diocesan revenues, the provision was carried out only in some dioceses. Hence an Act was passed in 1755 empowering Grand Juries to levy the cost of building off the counties. But little heed was paid to it, and a Royal Commission (1789-1791) in reporting the neglect, recommended that in addition to a building grant half the masters' salaries should also be borne by the county rates. Yet, in spite of every artifice to help on the scheme the Education Commissioners of 1810 doubt "whether a system should be continued which in its principle appears not altogether equitable, and has never been found efficient in practice." Things had gone on so badly that the Lord Lieutenant and Council, in 1824, fixed endowments for the maintenance of such schools as remained habitable. But the Education Enquiry Commission of that year report in May, 1827, that although he ordered the salaries for the masters he did not exercise his power of appointing masters to earn and claim the salaries; and they doubt "whether any attempt to establish permanent schoolhouses appropriated for the diocesan schools will be found ultimately successful. It has been seen that every endeavour hitherto made for that purpose, from the reign of Elizabeth, has failed, and that in fact there never were

so few, either of schools or scholars as at the present moment." Dr. Kyle, Secretary of the Commissioners of Education, stated in his evidence before the Endowed Schools Commission of 1855, with respect to seven of those Diocesan Free Schools, that five had not been in operation for 20 years past, one for 5 years, and another for 16 years; and in the case of those seven schools alone that "thus a sum of £9,000 has within 20 years been illegally withdrawn from the purposes of education."* Basing their calculation on Lord Lieutenants' Warrants and on Education Commissioners' Reports, a Committee of Irish Catholics in 1872 made out the following Bill of "arrears owing on account of contributions which the Protestant Bishops and Clergy were bound by law to make towards the support of Diocesan Schools, and which they did not pay:—

		£
Amount owing	... from 1570 to 1661—	100,555
,, ,,	,, 1661 to 1824—	63,570
,, ,, for 22 dioceses	,, 1661 to 1695—	24,310
,, ,, since 1824 acording to the notice in *Dublin Gazette* of April 17th 1824—		20,360
		£208,795

The last sum may, in part at least, as we have shown above, be recovered from persons still living. The remainder is fairly chargeable on the gross property of the late Established Church which is now vested in the hands of the Church Commissioners. That property was held subject to the charge of maintaining Diocesan Schools as a primary burden. Therefore, the accumulated arrears payable on foot of that charge must in equity be liquidated out of it. . . . That is to say:—For the purpose of reconstructing the system of Intermediate Education in Ireland, there is available an

* Endowed Schools Commission, Ireland, 1858, Question 21,369.

actual fund connected with Diocesan Schools of £1670 15s. 3d. (or under proper arrangements, of £5,000) a year, besides a capital sum of accumulated arrears amounting to £208,795, the interest upon which at 5 per cent. would be nearly £11,000 a year. In other words, were a new system of Intermediate Education in Ireland started, there ought to be available for the purpose of its support an annual income of nearly £16,000, derived from funds exclusively connected with the Diocesan Schools of the 12th Elizabeth." †

Dr. Kyle, whom I have already quoted, also stated before the Royal Commission on Primary Education, on 24th October, 1868, that "The whole system of Diocesan Schools is perfectly and completely rotten."

As part of his Plantation Scheme, James I., in 1608, set apart 100,000 acres of the confiscated lands for the endowment of the Protestant Church and the education of the people of Ulster; and he ordered that there should be one Free School at least in each county. That was the origin of the Royal Free Schools. But we can learn of the interest taken by his representatives in the education even of themselves from the fact that in 1633, Strafford, the Lord Deputy, complained that "the lands which were given to these charitable uses were dissipated, leased forth for little or nothing; and all the moneys raised for charitable uses are converted to private benefits." Little was done for thirty years more. The Commissioners of 1789-1791 report on the six Royal Free Schools then existing, that the master of one had no scholar; the master of another never kept a school, in fact, was an *absentee*; the master of another had, neither himself nor by proxy, done the duties of schoolmaster for some years. Later on some signs of life appeared; but the Reports of the Commissioners of

† Cf. Chap. III. of a very exhaustive work on "Intermediate and University Education in Ireland." Part I.: Intermediate Education. W. B. Kelly, Dublin. Simpkin, Marshall and Co., London. 1872.

1854-1858, and again of 1880-1881, show them as a whole in a condition of inefficiency and decay. Their net revenue from lands at the time of the Commission of 1879 was £5,463 17s. 8d. They were instituted as Free Schools; but although endowed for that purpose they have never been quite free. Ever since they have been used at all, they have been monopolised by middle-class Protestants although they should be made available for all.

In 1613, James I. gave to the Irish Society—*i.e.*, the London Companies of Undertakers—a charter of incorporation and grants of the City and County of Derry for, amongst other trusts, the purpose of education; in the words of the charter, "to stir up and recall the same province (of Ulster) from superstition, rebellion, calamity, and poverty, which heretofore have horribly raged therein, to religious obedience, strength, and prosperity." The property in charge of the Society has been frequently sequestrated for misuse of the trust. The surveyor of the Society, in his evidence before the Education Commission of 1868, set down its gross annual income at £21,059; and from a general statement of accounts which he presented, it transpires that one-third of that income held in trust "to recall (the people) from superstition, rebellion, calamity, to religious obedience, strength, and prosperity," has been consumed in the process of management.

In 1657, Erasmus Smith, who had obtained large tracts of land in several parts of Ireland under the Cromwellian Settlement, devoted some to the establishment of Free Grammar Schools. The most that can be said of that trust is that it has produced better educational results than those already mentioned. The Commissioners of 1854-1858 report that "the governors have not only neglected the primary trust of the Grammar Schools, but have not prudently managed the secondary trust of the English Schools." Their

complaint bears on neglect of inspection, extravagance in legal expenses, irregular keeping of accounts, and other such shortcomings.

I pass over the Bluecoat Hospital Free Schools founded in 1672; several endowed Grammar Schools founded in the course of the 18th century, after the manner of those of Erasmus Smith and the Irish Society, for the "settlement" of the country; the Foundling Hospital Schools, instituted in 1704 by the Duke of Ormond for the education of deserted children, maintained chiefly by Parliamentary grants for the "English order, habit, and language" purpose, ran as reproachful a career as the Charter Schools, and died for the benefit of the country about seventy years ago. The Charter Schools,* the tradition of which is one of injustice, cruelty, filth, immorality, and ignorance, whose managers and teachers would have been imprisoned if the Anti-Cruelty Society had existed in those days; the Hibernian Military School founded in 1769, and the Hibernian Marine School in 1775, both maintained out of the public funds, yet, till recently, appropriated for the children of Protestant soldiers. I pass over all those, and I come to the Schools founded in 1792 by "The Association for Discountenancing Vice, and Promoting the Knowledge and Practice of the Christian Religion."

These received very little support from private resources, but in 1800 a Parliamentary Grant was asked for and obtained. Their purpose was the same as that of all their predecessors, but some time passed before the cloven foot appeared. It was essential that the masters should be Protestants, and that the Bible should be read daily by all the pupils. Their promoters desired above all things the attendance of Catholic children.

* I have said enough about these schools in Chapter XVII., to which I refer the reader.

They professed to show a liberal disposition by insisting on no religious instruction for Catholic pupils beyond the simple reading of the Bible to which no Christian should object. They afforded the most spacious guarantee against proselytism which any school system had yet given, and many of the priests and laity thought that the necessity of the case justified the Catholics in giving them a fair trial as there was no hope of anything better. Having secured Catholic patronage they showed after some time that Popery was really the "vice" they desired to "discountenance." As soon as suspicion was raised they were denounced as being as bad as their predecessors. The Catholic children at once deserted them; they began to decay; the Parliamentary Grant which had already amounted to £80,000 was discontinued, and they finally disappeared in 1827.

The same in purpose, and similar but more militant in method was the London Hibernian Society which set to work in the early years of the last century to, in the words of its leaders, "make perpetual inroads on the Kingdom of Satan" in Ireland "by the power of truth and of superior piety." Similar also was the result of its activity; for it died after a few years' labour, leaving their faith more dear to the Irish people, and Protestantism an object of deeper contempt in their memory.

Seeing that other methods, both overt and covert, were in vain, a number of Protestant gentlemen put their heads together in Dublin to devise a more insidious and effective process of proselytism. No, they would not seek to proselytise the people; they would not wean them from their old mother tongue. They themselves in fact loved the old Gaelic (*i.e.*, in the mouths of Popish peasants), and they would do their best to preserve it. But the Christian love that bound all Christians into one common

family made their hearts melt with pity for the illiteracy of the people, and they would educate them. Thus arose the "Irish Society for Promoting the Education of the Native Irish through the Medium of their own Language," which began operations, I think, in 1818. It professed simply to teach the people reading and writing in the dear old language which they loved, and through the Word of God which as Christians they professed to love also, and thirsted to know if the priests would only let them. I have now by me several volumes containing different parts of the Bible published at that time and for that purpose. In proof that their motive was charity only, the work was maintained by voluntary contributions; the people for whom the boon was meant were not asked to contribute a copper, so unlike the Popish worship, the cost of which is always borne by those who practise it. The British and Foreign Bible Society had, before the sitting of the Royal Commission of 1825, spent £80,000 on the printing and publication of Irish Bibles. Bibles were scattered broadcast everywhere. Dr. Doyle, in a letter * written in 1824, was able to give this testimony of the propagandist zeal:—"Do not the pawn-offices in every town bear testimony of the profusion there is of what these saints quaintly call 'the bread of life,' and of what we Catholics call Protestant Bibles—books on which our peasantry look not with reverence, but with dread?" But on the same page he gives the following evidence of the result:—"I have heard of a poor man in the Co. Kildare who, if I gave him a Bible approved of by the Church, would venerate it more than anything he possessed, but having been favoured by the lady of his master with one of the Societies' Bibles without note or comment, accepted of it

* Letters on Education in Ireland and on Bible Societies: Addressed to a friend in England: 1824—page 39.

with all the reverence which the fear of losing his situation inspired; but, behold! when the night closed, and all danger of detection was removed, he, lest he should be infected with heresy exhaled from the Protestant Bible during his sleep, took it with a tongs, for he would not defile his touch with it, and buried it in a grave which he had prepared for it in his garden." That Kildare man's action was a symbol of Catholic instinct all over the country; the work was subsidised, the zeal was spent in vain, and this new patent for the proselytism of the Papists followed fast its predecessors to the grave.

But their zeal was not quite spent, and they tried another way. They knew that—"No man putteth new wine into old bottles; otherwise the wine will burst the bottles, and both the wine will be spilled and the bottles will be lost. But the new wine will be put into new bottles." Their zeal, however, led them astray in the application—they put the old wine into new bottles. A new system was introduced in 1811 under the name of "The Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland." A guarantee was given to the Catholics that no attempt would be made to turn the teaching into a proselytising agency. The Catholics did not at all approve of the system; but they were in a desperate condition in those days, and as they had no hope of getting what they desired, they determined to do the best they could with what they were getting, trusting for security to the guarantees given. Government after a few years gave a grant-in-aid. In 1817 the Board meetings of the Society began to be held in Kildare St., and it has since been known as the "Kildare Street Society." For a few years faith seemed to be kept with the Catholics. But the Society having got the Catholic children into its schools thought it could afford to play with the guarantees and defy the Catholic leaders, and in 1820 began to co-operate in the work of three well-known proselytising

Societies. Father M'Hale, then a young Maynooth Professor, afterwards Archbishop of Tuam, who, whilst he privately condemned the system from the beginning, had hitherto kept silent, as O'Connell and some of the Bishops and priests consented to give it a fair trial, now saw his opportunity, and under the name of "Hierophilus" assailed without mercy both the principles and the working of the Society. O'Connell withdrew from and denounced it; so did such Protestants as the Duke of Leinster and Lord Cloncurry; and the Society was left without any members on whose impartiality the Catholics could rely. Dr. Doyle had become Bishop of Kildare the year before, and he at once, in letters to Sir Henry Parnell, Archbishop Murray, and others, assailed the system without condition or quarter. In a letter to Dr. Murray dated 16th Sept., 1824, he wrote:—"I am clearly and decidedly of opinion that it is not lawful for any Catholic to assist or co-operate with the Kildare-Place Society in carrying into effect their system of Education." Yet Lecky,* in the course of a paragraph in praise of that Society's schools, writes—"A great number of useful publications were printed by the Society, and we have the high authority of Dr. Doyle for stating that he never found anything objectionable (to Catholics) in them." Sir Horace Plunkett gives the passage in his book, and with characteristic credulity accepts it without question. Thus are untruths unconsciously palmed off by writers on their readers, and a party tradition is formed in time. The class who now desiderate words to praise the genius of Dr. Doyle, used to malign him without scruple and attack him without regard for truth whilst he was alive. Little wonder! For him, principles were things too sacred to trifle with. Once he grasped a principle he never let it go; and whilst he

* Leaders of Public Opinion in Ireland: Vol. II., 124.

fearlessly fought for his principles he asked for no quarter and he gave none.

He wrote† :—"But it is said to the Catholics: you and your clergy are only tolerated in the State; and therefore the Government cannot be expected to confide to you the regulation of public instruction. . . . . If then we deserve to be even tolerated, we deserve to be educated; for otherwise, even as slaves, our value is diminished; and if it be desirable to educate us, and that it is a crime against nature to withdraw our children from our authority and control, why not permit us to regulate their education? Why obtrude on our inalienable rights? Why infringe on the parental privilege of which the Legion itself did not deprive us? Do we wish or require to be entrusted with the public instruction? No; we seek only that the portion of it which regards ourselves be entrusted to us; we do not desire to put our sickle into another man's harvest; you would not confide the instruction of your children to us; do not oblige us to entrust ours to you.

"As to the State bestowing aid—we feel indebted for it—we will be grateful for it; we shall not even think, if you will, that the State exists only for the good of the people, that we are its subjects, that we pay its taxes, supply its luxuries, bear all its burdens, fight and die for its aggrandisement or glory. We will waive all right to the public money, and sit like Lazarus, expecting the crums. All this we will do, only do not afflict us by interposing your authority between us and our children; do not estrange from us the mind or affection of our little ones, or teach them from their infancy to regard the stranger as entitled to their confidence; do not intimate to them that their parent and pastor are unfit to train their mind, and form their heart, or

† Letters on Education in Ireland, and on Bible Societies, to a friend in England: by J. K. L. 1824. Pages 13 and 14.

introduce them to the world. If your object be to seduce them from the faith for which we have suffered, and into which they have been baptized; avow it—tell us so—and we will retire with them into the desert, and tell our misfortunes to the rocks; or we will cease to beget children in our bondage, and let our name be forgotten, and our race extinguished." The schools of the Kildare Street Society were soon deserted by the Catholic children; the system was practically swept away by the storm of O'Connell's agitation, and in 1831, Mr. Stanley, the Chief Secretary, declared in Parliament that it was an utter failure, and that it should no longer be subsidised by public money.

He proposed our present system of Primary Education as an improvement on the Kildare Street system. It seems that Mr. Stanley, who designed the National System, earnestly meant to protect Catholic children from proselytism in the system of united secular and separate instruction which he introduced. He knew that an absolute ban had once been placed on the education of the Catholics of Ireland, and that the prohibition was a failure. He knew that the Charter Schools, which for ninety years had been used to entrap Catholic children at a total cost to the public of nearly £2,000,000, were a failure and a fraud—finally condemned by Royal Commissions as sinks of ignorance and iniquity, or as John Howard, the English philanthropist, said, "a disgrace to Protestants—a disgrace to all society." He knew that the Kildare Street system which followed, pledged to fair play and thereby securing the countenance and support of Catholics, allied to avowed proselytising societies as soon as its promoters thought themselves safe, then forsaken and denounced by the Catholics whose trust had been thus betrayed, was dying the death of the Charter Schools. The delusion was at length given up by government that the Catholics of

Ireland could be Protestantised by Scripture Schools established under pretence of educating them. The Chief Secretary, therefore, designed a system for the combined secular and separate religious instruction of the children. It was set forth in a letter addressed by him to the Duke of Leinster, and according to the terms of that letter Parliament granted to the Commissioners appointed to administer the system the necessary money for the purpose. The Commissioners were to be appointed by the Lord Lieutenant. In fact the whole system, money and administration was placed under his supreme control. He appointed seven Commissioners, of whom only two were Catholics—only two Catholics out of seven to apply a system of popular education intended for children the vast majority of whom were Catholics; and of those two, one, Dr. Murray, the Archbishop of Dublin, having passed through penal times, naturally saw in any concession an improvement of what had been, and now nearly 70 years old, was more disposed to sing his *nunc dimittis* that he had seen the dawn of better days, than to fight a privileged majority; the other, the Right Hon. A. R. Blake, of whose grasp of Catholic principles, or of his willingness to incur Protestant displeasure for their sake, the less said the better. Of the Protestant majority, if all were men like the Duke of Leinster the Catholics might get fair play; but then there was Dr. Sadlier, Professor of Divinity in Trinity College; Robert Holmes, whose presence was as regular at Protestant Synods as at the Four Courts; Dr. Whately, an English parson and well-known anti-Catholic writer, just sent over as Protestant Archbishop of Dublin; and Rev. Mr. Carlile, a Scotch Presbyterian minister, hitherto unknown unless in connection with Bible Societies. Rev. Mr. Carlile held the position of Resident Commissioner; the work of the Commissioners was practically done by him and by Dr.

Whately, and the design of Mr. Stanley was soon distorted by them.

They interpolated the letter of the Chief Secretary, which was to all intents and purposes a State document, and the Charter of the System. They introduced a clause into it which enabled them to gradually mix religious and secular instruction in the schools. The following is the whole passage, with the interpolated part in italics:—

"The Commissioners will exercise the most entire control over all the books to be used in the schools, whether in the combined moral and literary, or separate religious instruction; none to be employed in the first, except under the sanction of the Board, nor in the latter but with the approbation of those members of the Board who are of the same religious persuasion with those for whose use they are intended. *Although it is not designed to exclude from the list of books for the combined instruction such portions of sacred Scripture, or of religious or moral teaching, as may be approved by the Board, it is to be understood that this is by no means intended to convey a perfect and sufficient religious education, or to supersede the necessity of a separate religious instruction on the day set apart for that purpose.*" They had the letter in its genuine form hung up in the schools over the country, but they acted according to the meaning of the interpolated letter.

Let us see now how they played on that passage. (1)—They published their first Report in 1834, and in it they say:—"We have thus shown to all who choose to read our Rules, with the view of understanding them, not perverting them, that, while we desire to bring Christian children of all denominations together, so that they may receive instruction *in common in those points of education which do not clash with any particular religious opinion*, we take care that sufficient time be set

apart for separate religious instruction, and that the Minister of God's Word of all Christian creeds, and those approved by them, shall have the fullest opportunity of reading and expounding it, and of seeing that the children of their respective denominations do read and understand it, not only weekly, but daily if they think fit." Here was the first attempt at giving to all children religious instruction in common, but "without clashing with any particular religious opinions." The Rule of "separate religious instruction" for the children, as approved by the clergy of each, was still in operation. (2)—But in 1834 the Rule assumed this form—"One day in each week (exclusive of Sunday) is to be set apart for religious instruction of the children, on which day *such pastors or other persons as are approved of by the parents or guardians of the children,* shall have access to them for that purpose." Thus the pastoral authority was wholly ignored, and religious instruction was to be given by those only whom the parents approved. Thus was taken away all security for any regular or real religious instruction in the schools. Yet parents should approve of the religious instruction given to their children, and no person should dare to give such instruction to their children without their positive act of approval. (3)—In 1838 appeared the following change in the Rule —"One day each week, *or part of a day,* is to be set apart for religious instruction." The way is carefully prepared for the change in Fourth Report (1837), Nos. 35, 36, and 37. According to Mr. Stanley's letter one whole day was to be specially devoted to religious instruction, so as to keep the religious instruction quite separate. But now secular and religious teaching are to meet on one day of the week. That change was brought about by Mr. Carlile, at the desire of the Presbyterians. (4)—In 1838 another change was also made to the effect that children might be present and receive

religious instruction if *their parents did not object.* Hitherto they should not be present at any religious instruction unless their parents *positively* approved, now they may attend unless their parents *object.* Thus, what was an exception now becomes a rule. Anyone can see the suspicious connection between those two changes made in 1838. Children might have passed without their parents' knowledge, through much religious instruction to which their parents would object if they only knew of it. (5)—In 1840 another change was made, according to which "patrons of schools have the right of appointing such religious instruction as they think proper to be given therein provided that each school be open to all children of all communions, that due regard be had to parental right and authority; that accordingly no child be *compelled* to receive, or be present at, any religious instruction to which his parents or guardians object, and that the time for giving it be so fixed that no child shall be thereby, in effect, excluded, directly or indirectly, from the other advantages which the schools affords. Subject to this the religious instruction may be given either during the fixed school hours or otherwise." According to this new form of the Rule, neither a day nor part of a day is specially set apart for religious instruction. The manager may have it at any hour of the day he chose, but children shall not be *compelled* to be present at it—not compelled, but they may be invited, persuaded, or induced.

Let us see how we stand now. Mr. Stanley's letter, on which the system was based, provided that a special day be set apart for religious instruction, which was to be under the control of the clergy. In the hands of Dr. Whately and Mr. Carlile the special day became part of a day, and might be any hour of the day according to the wish of the managers of the school. Side by side with those changes as to time, authority over religious

instruction was transferred from the clergy to the parents or guardians, as if the clergy who instructed the parents and guardians had not also their approval to instruct their children or wards. The purpose of the change is quite plain. But the children should not be present at any religious instruction unless the parents *positively approved*; then the children may be present unless the parents *objected*; and when the hours as well as the days for religious instruction were mixed up with those for secular instruction, the Commissioners affected a characteristic care for the consciences of the children by providing that they should not be *compelled* to receive any religious instruction to which their parents or guardians objected. And now after ten years, when all this process had been gone through, when the original design which Mr. Stanley proposed and which Parliament confirmed had been completely changed and the country had got used to it, the Commissioners felt that the seed they had sown was ripe, and they publish for the first time in their Report for 1841 Mr. Stanley's letter with the interpolated passage on which they had been acting all along, but which they had carefully concealed. There it was—their legal justification for having broken down the barrier which the original Charter was supposed to have placed between secular and religious instruction in the National Schools. And they publish it without the slightest note or hint that it was not the exact letter written by Mr. Stanley, hung up in every school in the country, and published as an introduction to their 1st Report. If I call such conduct downright dishonesty, or public perfidy, I may be blamed for using strong language; so I let those who would think so find some milder expression to fit it if they can.

(6)—In 1847, the preposition "*to*" was inserted into the Rule, and its presence made another change, known

as the "Stopford Rule," which left the children completely at the mercy of managers and teachers for the religious instruction which they received. Thus, by a process patiently and cunningly worked out, not only the clergy but the parents were shut out from the control of the religious training of their children. By such chicanery, it came to pass that hundreds of Catholic children in the National Schools of the North were daily receiving religious instruction from Protestant teachers. According to Mr. Keenan, Head Inspector, the practice was universal in Belfast, and in the Counties of Londonderry and Antrim. By sharp practices like these Dr. Whately, whilst protesting in public against a suspicion, or even the possibility, of proselytism, was able to write in private—"Such I believe to be the process by which the minds of a large portion of Roman Catholics have been prepared, and are now being prepared for the reception of Protestant doctrines. The Education supplied by the National Board is gradually undermining the vast fabric of the Irish Roman Catholic Church"*

The Presbyterians had only to make a protest and they got whatever concessions they wanted, although the granting of some of those concessions changed in their favour the fundamental constitution of the National System. They received concession after concession till by the year 1840 they had gained all they wanted, and henceforth they became vehement partisans of the system which they had hitherto vehemently assailed. That same year the Catholic Bishops asked for same very reasonable concessions, but they were peremptorily refused. Dr. McHale opposed the system, or rather the administration of it, because he thought it at least un-National and un-Catholic. And looking back at the working of the system in those days, will

* *Life of Dr. Whately*, page 244.

anyone say that he was mistaken? He felt, and he had reason to feel, that every system of education tried in Ireland was a system the purpose of which was not so much to educate as to pervert the people. It was only a question of degree, or a difference in the method of reaching the one fixed purpose, from the penal prohibition of all Catholic teaching, to schools of open proselytism, thence to a system in which the purpose was more cleverly concealed. And what was the National System, as applied by the early Commissioners who controlled the Board, but a more sly and slow, yet equally sure process by which the perversion of the people was sought to be accomplished? Of those methods, the first was the fairest, though bad was the best of them. The earlier contrivances were clumsy, but their purpose was at least avowed. I remember reading in Aubrey de Vere's *Inisfail* the following lines written by him on a parallel episode in Irish history; but they make a picture also of the position of Irish Catholics with regard to those anti-Catholic and anti-Irish schemes for educating them:—

> Praise to the valiant and faithful foe,
> Give us noble foes, not the friend who lies;
> We dread the drugg'd cup, not the open blow,
> We dread the old hate in the new disguise.

According to Mr. Stanley's letter, the Commissioners were directed to supply the schools with books for moral and literary instruction at half price, and with books for separate religious instruction, to be compiled by the different denominations for the use of the children of each, at first cost; also the Protestant version of the Scriptures for Protestant children, and the Douay Bible for Catholic children. The Catholic members of the Board, anxious to give the system a fair trial, agreed to the arrangement. But Rev. Mr. Carlile objected that he had "a conscientious scruple, as a Protestant, to have

books exclusively Catholic disseminated at the public expense." The Catholic members were overruled, and the Resident Commissioner had his way. But, whilst "the zeal of God's house had eaten up" the English Protestant Archbishop and the Scotch Presbyterian minister for the salvation of Irish Catholic children, they had the Evangelical prudence 'to make friends with the Mammon of iniquity.' The Rev. Mr. Carlile proposed that books of selected extracts from the Scriptures be compiled, and he had no conscientious scruple to undertake the task himself, nor does he appear to have thought that Catholics should have any conscientious objection. Moreover, the Reading Books for the use of the schools as well as the religious books were compiled, some by Dr. Whately and his daughters, the rest of them by Rev. Mr. Carlile, assisted by some Scotch Presbyterians and English Protestants. In fact, it was quite a family affair. No Irishman or Catholic was supposed to understand the literary, moral, or religious needs of the children of their own race and faith. And those are the men whose memory is revived, when we would fain forget them, by Dr. Starkie, the present Resident Commissioner who, in his address before the British Association in Belfast, in 1902, vaunting himself a Munster Catholic, extols the "zeal and ability" of a Whately and a Carlile in the cause of Irish education, whilst he casts a slight on the memory of John of Tuam, and marks the stigma of an obscurantist upon his grave.

The natural consequence followed; and justly did Cardinal Cullen, in the course of his examination before the Royal Commission of 1869, declare that "if all the books printed by the National Board were sent out to the middle of the Atlantic and cast into the ocean, Ireland and her literature would suffer no great loss." He computed as a probable estimate that £200,000, or

£300,000, had been expended in printing those books, in selling them at reduced rates, or in distributing them as gifts. Thus, they were forced on the country without the possibility of competition as to printing or authorship. In other words, the Commissioners created a monopoly for Dr. Whately and his daughters, for Rev. Mr. Carlile and his friends, and made the public pay for it. It is not recorded that either Dr. Whately or Rev. Mr. Carlile ever protested to the Board that he had "a conscientious scruple, as a Protestant," to receive revenue by the monopoly thus created in school-books and Scripture lessons, which were moreover as anti-Catholic and as anti-Irish as they dared to make them. In one of those books they refer to our Divine Lord as *born of the Children of Eve*, although even according to their own Bible He was born of the Virgin Mary; but I suppose they had "a conscientious scruple" to tell the truth, lest it should cherish in the children a veneration for our Blessed Lady. In another book they cunningly connect civil liberty with the "Reformation," leaving the impression that slavery was begotten of the "Church of Rome." I could give other instances, all with an anti-Catholic bias, and some of them plain historical untruths.

There are only a few passing references to Ireland, and these are either misleading or simply false. The First Edition of one of the books contained some pieces of poetry in which reference is made to "harps," "shamrocks," and the "Green banks of Shannon." Very harmless, one would think; but these pieces disappeared from the Second Edition. Also Campbell's *Downfall of Poland*, and Scott's well-known lines, "Breathes there a man with soul so dead, etc." were kept out of the Second Edition, lest Irish children should have occasion to read that "Freedom shrieked as Kosciusko fell," or lest any of them should pronounce

"This is my own, my native land." No—such words as "The Virgin Mary," "The Green Banks of Shannon," "Freedom," "Native Land," might be productive of Idolatry or disloyalty if the tongue or mind of an Irish Catholic child got used to them. But in their stead, the Second Edition, published in 1838, contains such as the following:—

> "I thank the goodness and the grace
> That on my birth have smiled,
> And made me in these Christian days
> A happy English child."

And again:—"On the east of Ireland is England where the Queen lives; many people who live in Ireland were born in England, and we speak the same language, and are called one nation."

Now, what was the plain purpose of all this? Evidently, to steal the love of their faith and the love of their motherland from the young hearts of those little ones whom these men undertook the awful responsibility of educating according to the Irish Catholic instincts which they inherited from their fathers. It was a plain perversion of ingenuity to rob young hearts of the treasures which God and nature gave them.

Thus, Irish Catholic children, whilst their hearts were plastic, were brought under un-Catholic influences, and were trained to think of Ireland as a western province of England with no more national individuality than an English shire. In my boyhood I thought the epithet "West-Briton" a far-fetched nickname; but I have come to learn that it is literally correct. Whenever individual Catholics get unmoored by proselytising influences from the rock on which Christ built His Church, they either wander about in religious indifference without a compass to guide them, or whilst hating the old religion they use but despise the new one. Similarly, the effect of the thing called National Education on the

Irish mind and character has been to lessen or to destroy that genuine idea of patriotism which is a positive principle of thought and action subsisting in itself, and to replace it by a spurious patriotism, which chiefly consists in hating England. True Irish patriotism should not consist in being anti-English, or anti-French, or anti-German, but simply in being Irish. The action of the Early Commissioners, when it did not produce a West Briton, fostered, unknown to themselves, in spite of their plans, and opposed to their purpose, a counterfeit patriotism which consisted chiefly in being anti-English.

Having watched the working of the system with suspicion till he could remain doubtful no longer of the danger to the faith and nationality of the rising generation, Dr. McHale began in 1838 a series of letters, which he addressed to Lord John Russell, and in which he unravelled without reserve or mercy the web of falsehood and fraud which, as I have pointed out, Dr. Whately and his friends had been carefully weaving under pretence of providing popular education for the Irish people. In 1852 Dr. Murray died. Dr. Cullen succeeded him. He fully shared Dr. McHale's opinion of the National System; and with an ability and a constancy rarely combined in one man he fought the Commissioners and the System which they administered from the day he came to Dublin till the day he died. The Commissioners soon found that they had now to deal with a very different man from the aged Dr. Murray. Dr. Cullen was only one year in Dublin when he forced them to put aside the edition of those schoolbooks which contained such objectionable passages as those I have quoted. Dr. Whately now lost all hope of abusing the system to pervert the people. He finally retired from the Board in 1853, when he had failed to force his *Evidences of Christianity* into the schools—a

book in which, by the way, I do not remember to have seen a word about the Divinity of Christ. The evidence Cardinal Cullen gave before the Powis Commission is the ablest evidence of the kind I have ever read, not excepting the famous evidence of Dr. Doyle before Parliament. It was the first fair opportunity that he got of exposing the system, and when he had done with it there was hardly a rag left to cover it. His evidence was the first really effective assault that was made on the un-Irish character of the National School books; and as a result a new set of lesson books were provided, more Irish than their predecessors, but yet unfit, as even the best of the National School books are unfit to-day, to interest Irish Catholic children, to make reading an attraction to them rather than a task, or to draw out their native feelings to their natural development as heirs to the traditions of their country.

Ever since the National System began the Catholic managers have been in a state of suspicion, watching and struggling against the tendencies and the attempts I have just described. They have never had that feeling of security which is necessary for one who wants to devise projects of improvement for the schools which he is supposed to control. Besides, it would have been waste of time of them to devise such projects, for they have always been so fettered by the Commissioners that their projects could not pass beyond the paper on which they drafted them. Some time ago, a person with more impulsiveness than experience said to the manager of a country school, "Why don't you, managers, do something to improve education in your schools?" The manager saw that he was dealing with a person of more assurance than sense, and he replied—Well, I cannot; but I am not incapable of learning how. Suppose, then, that you were manager of my schools, what would you do? What improvement would you make, and how

would you set about it? I mean, in fact, not in talk." The bubble burst at once; the critic felt foolish, and his educational zeal was spent. It is so with the hypercritical generally. Their theories are but bubbles and bladders. They can find holes or make them, but they cannot mend them. They appear solid, but are all an outside; are usually men with little intelligence, and the little they have wants balance.

We have seen that the Presbyterians objected to the National System from the start. But the Early Commissioners granted them all the concessions they asked, and from being its fiercest opponents they became its warmest friends. But those concessions completely changed the original constitution of the National System, which was to be a system of united secular and separate religious instruction. Denominationalism then reigned in the Presbyterian schools, but their denominationalism implied the proselytism of Catholic children. The Catholics were opposed to the principle of the mixed system, inasmuch as a complete Catholic education is not possible under such a system; but hopeless of better they determined to give it a fair trial. They thought that under the circumstances it was both right and wise to tolerate in fact what they disapproved as imperfect in principle; and they showed themselves ready to make compromises as far as their principles allowed them. But their toleration was turned against them. "I cannot openly support the Education Board as an instrument of conversion," wrote Dr. Whately; "I have to fight its battle with one hand, and that the best, tied behind me."*

But the action of those who controlled the Board in the cause of proselytism became a Balaam's ass for the Catholics, inasmuch as separate schools for Catholics and Protestants arose, and have been steadily increasing in number ever since. Hence, Lord Derby, formerly

* *Life of Dr. Whately*, page 246.

Mr. Stanley, speaking in the House of Lords in 1858 on the change made on his original plan, confessed that "as a system of united education it had to a considerable extent failed." In 1867, as many as 39 per cent. of the National Schools were unmixed, that is, were used by either Catholics or Protestants exclusively. Cardinal Cullen proved before the Royal Commission of 1869 that the trend of Protestants as well as Catholics in Ireland was towards Denominational Education, and he held that the disposition should be respected, special provision to be made for places where separate schools would be impossible; and the Commissioners, mostly Protestant and without a single Catholic ecclesiastic amongst them, were nearly unanimous in affirming the Cardinal's views. Isaac Butt, in a work which he published in 1865,* made out a powerful case for the denominational system. The Irish people themselves who have most right to be heard on the question, since "Institutions are made for the people, not the people for institutions," have been constantly asserting the principle by their action ever since. I give the shortest and strongest proof of their wishes in the following percentages of National Schools which are used solely by Protestants or solely by Catholics. I have said that in 1867, 39 per cent. of the National Schools were unmixed; that is, used solely by Protestants or solely by Catholics. In 1881 it was so in 44.9 per cent. They go on yearly increasing till 1887 when they are 50.6 per cent., *i.e.*, more than one-half. Then, beginning with the year 1891 and going on to the year 1900, the percentages are as follows:—54.3, 54.4, 54.5, 55.5, 55.6 61.2, 61.6, 61.9, 62.5; and the year 1900 shows that 64.4 of the National Schools are unmixed. That is, in 1900, out of 8,673 National Schools in Ireland, 5,585 are used by Catholics or by Protestants exclusively.

* *The Liberty of Teaching Vindicated.*

But that is not all. Mr. Butt, in the book I have just referred to, says that when he moved for a Parliamentary return of the Catholics and Protestants in each school in 1862, it transpired that "a large number were set down as united schools, because in a school attended by 70 or 80 Roman Catholics, one solitary Protestant appeared to have been entered on the books."* Those 5,585 schools are *absolutely unmixed*; but of the remaining 3,088 schools it is certain that many are *practically unmixed*. I suppose that all the National Schools in the villages and small towns of Munster are used exclusively by Catholics, except whenever a Protestant police-constable with a family happens to be stationed in the neighbourhood. Yet, the children dare not bless themselves, or place a Penny Catechism on the benches, or look at a religious picture, or even at the Sign of Man's Redemption hanging on the wall, lest the sacred principle of mixed education be profaned—a principle which the Early Commissioners themselves were the first to violate to please the Presbyterians. If the managers of schools which are exclusively Catholic or exclusively Protestant would heed my advice I would say to them—Let the children of the Protestant schools have their Bibles on the benches, let the children of the Catholic schools practice what acts of devotion they please, provided the standard of secular education be secured, and let the Commissioners refuse the School Grant, if they dare. That would make short work of this official trifling with the will of a people. It is high time the country were set free from the Royal Commissions, the changes, the muddling and the tinkering such as we have witnessed, in order by hook or by crook to justify the fiction of mixed education, or lest a Catholic child should do the "idolatrous" act of praying before a picture of our Blessed Lady.

* Page 141.

Referring to the Conscience Clauses, which are necessary in every system of mixed education, Butt says:—"I believe it is impossible to estimate the mischief that is done to the true cause of education by a constant and vexatious interference with the course of each school. I have heard it said that two-thirds of the correspondence of the Commissioners is occupied in investigating cases of real, or supposed, violation of those rules. The inspection of the schools becomes a species of police visitation. . . . . Education in Ireland is carried on under the most vexatious supervision of a moral excise—a constant and harassing vigilance against contraband religious teaching."*

I will let Butt also answer the plea, or rather the pretence, that "the influence of mixed education would mitigate the religious asperities which are the bane of Ireland." His reply is very plain:—"It is a singular commentary on the theory of united education, that the only districts in Ireland in which anything like united education is to be found, are exactly those in which religious dissensions too often manifest themselves in conflicts of violence and blood. The town of Belfast, in proportion to its population, has more children of different persuasions in the same schools than any other district of Ireland."†

For a quarter of a century Cardinal Cullen attacked the administration of the system, and before his death he had succeeded in drawing the anti-Catholic poison from the system, and in eliminating from the class-books at least what was anti-Irish. Had he lived longer he would have done more.

It is true that parish priests have been managers of the vast majority of the National Schools. But the functions of a manager have been restricted from the

* *loc cit*: page 148-149.

† Page 142.

beginning to simply seeing that the Rules of the Board are observed. Managers have never had any control over the teaching, the subjects taught, or the books used. Under the Revised Programme of 1901, they were granted power to initiate programmes suited to their respective localities. But, as they have been made to understand more than once, that pretended power to initiate merely meant the power to *suggest*, which every man in the country as well as the managers enjoys without any Revised Programme, or without saying by your leave to anybody. Whether their initiative would have been an influence for good or evil on the Primary Education of the country cannot be known, since they have never had the right to initiate. A man has no incentive to put his heart and head into a work unless he has the power to produce results. Who but an imbecile would take the trouble to think out programmes unless he feels that he has an effective voice in their adoption? Dr. Starkie who, as Resident Commissioner controls the system, seems to be either incapable or careless. The Revised Programme, such as it is, has been carried out in such a hap-hazard way as to leave one in doubt whether the Resident Commissioner takes any more pains or gives any more serious thought to the system which he is highly paid to administer than to rush occasionally into the Education Office, order men and things about according to his passing humour, and have his fiat felt in every school in the country. Of one thing I am certain; he has shown himself blamably ignorant of the development of the system. I have read the Address, or rather the attack which he went to Belfast to deliver against the managers. Whatever may be the shortcomings of the managers, that address revealed the Resident Commissioner as a very clumsy diplomatist and even a crude educationist. He evidently had not grasped some of the leading features of

the English Education system, and whilst he referred authoritatively to the early Reports of the Irish Commissioners, he plainly betrayed the fact that he had not read them at all.* How far the managers would have shown themselves capable educationists if they had any initiative power in the schools during the past seventy years, it is hard to say, since they have had no such power. But considering what the functions of managers have been in the system, it is neither fair nor ingenuous in Sir Horace Plunkett to hold them responsible for the "character and *morale*" of the people, so far as these qualities have been influenced by the teaching of the National Schools.

The managers, it is true, have had the appointment of the teachers. But the efficiency of teachers depends largely on their training; yet the National System was in existence for half a century, its teachers were multiplying over the country, and there was only one Training College provided to turn them out fit for their work. The Catholic bishops would willingly have established a Training College for Catholic teachers; but not only were they refused any Government subsidy for its support, but it would not be recognised, even though maintained without any public subsidy at all. The number of untrained teachers was increasing to such an alarming extent that so far back as 1859 the Chief Inspector officially recommended what the bishops had been asking for; but the Resident Commissioner of the time solved the difficulty simply by cutting out the passage from the Chief Inspector's Report. What was the consequence? In 1866 there was 4,369 untrained teachers in the National Schools of Ireland. The Powis Commission of 1869 recommended the petition of the bishops, but the recommendation remained buried in a Blue

* Cfr. Reply to Dr. Starkie's Attack on the Managers of National Schools. Gill & Son, Dublin, 1903.

Book. In 1874 the number of untrained teachers had increased to 6,284, and in 1883 to 7,069; that is to say, two-thirds of the teachers were untrained. The responsible authorities preferred to see the country swarming with untrained teachers than let Catholic teachers have a place where they would get a professional training both as teachers and as Catholics. Yet, in England and in Scotland, where the Catholics were in a small minority, Catholic Training Colleges had been for years recognised and supported by the State. Finally, Earl Spencer, in 1883, ordered the scandal to be removed. Two Catholic Training Colleges, one for male and the other for female teachers, at once sprang into existence. But they had to be built and equipped from private sources, and they received from the State only part of the annual cost of their support, whilst the one undenominational College had been built, equipped, and supported entirely by public money from the beginning. Seven years later, Mr. Balfour arranged that all the annual cost of their support should be defrayed by the State; but the principal, and the interest on the money borrowed for their building and equipment still remained. These Catholic Training Colleges have not only increased the number of trained teachers in the country, but they have improved the training also, even in the Government Training College. For forty years the course of training in that Institution of Marlborough Street extended over about half a year. In 1875 it was extended to one year. The Catholic Training Colleges began their work with a two years' course of training, and the expensive undenominational nursling of half a century had to follow in their wake. Yet in face of all this, it appears from a correspondence between the Bishop of Limerick and Mr. Wyndham, the late Chief Secretary, that £50,000 has been recently devoted to the extension of the Marlborough Street Training

College out of the Irish Development Fund, whilst three Catholic Colleges are left to live in hope of being considered in some prospective "improvement" in the system of Irish Primary Education. It is said now that the system is defective. Be it so; but it is what its framers and its organisers have made it. Let those who are responsible bear the blame. It shows only the weakness or the selfishness of a street-urchin, on being found out, to point the finger towards another and cry, "'twas he did it." Those who framed the system and have had supreme control of it in their hands now seek to fasten the fault of its shortcomings on the priests, as if these ever had any effective power to improve it.

Before the confiscation of Catholic property the schools of this country were supported out of means which ecclesiastical authorities held in trust for these and other purposes. The legalised spoiler came, and the people and their Church were left beggars and outlaws in their own land; left without a school in which to instruct their children, or a house in which to adore their God. Out of that confiscated property, besides Parliamentary Grants from the Treasury, were founded and maintained Trinity College, the Parish Schools, the Diocesan Free Schools, the Royal Free Schools, the Charter Schools, the Hibernian Military and Marine Schools, the Kildare Street Society Schools, and other Endowed Schools down to our own day, the acknowledged purpose of some of them, and the real object of all, being to Anglicise and to Protestantise the people. It was the plain purpose to make them renegades from their nation and traitors to their faith; and what was above all wicked in the policy was that they were to pay the cost of their own perversion. They were deprived of their property, and then reviled as paupers; they were disabled by an iniquity which legislators call "law" from teaching or being taught unless at the cost of their faith and their national honour, and then held up to scorn for being

illiterate. After millions of acres and of money had been plundered from, and then used against them; after they had been beaten to the ground, had, like the early Christians in the Catacombs, hidden the mysteries of their Faith amidst the mountains, and kept their national spirit alive in the bogs and in the woods, they came out and appeared again at the opening of the last century with the freshness, the hope, and the vigour of youth. And yet they are without "strenuous qualities." They provided their own primary schools till the National system came, and they have, for the most part, out of their private resources, paid for the schools which have been built under that system down to this day. Sir Thomas Wyse * states that the Irish priests provided for the education of four times as many children "with infinitely less than one-twentieth part of the means" than did the State-endowed Charter Schools. He says that a priest in Lewisburg, Co. Sligo, "established no less than thirteen schools with little other assistance than what he derived from his own exertions," and that "there are many similar instances to be found in many parts in Ireland." Father Thos. Maguire, the celebrated controversialist, established eight schools over his extensive parish amidst the mountains of Leitrim.† I have been told by one who has seen the wills of several priests of those days that those who had any money saved left

* History of the Catholic Association, Vol. II.—Appendix: page 92. Published in 1829.

† At a meeting in Leitrim, in 1826, Father Maguire said: "There are five schools in my parish under the plan of the Hibernian School Society. I warned the people not to send their children to them, and, at the same time, set a subscription on foot, by collecting a penny a week from some, and a halfpenny a week from others, and paying £5 5s. a year myself. I was able to establish eight schools in their stead. They are now open to public inspection, and I would venture to say that the children improve faster, and make greater progress in learning than any of those in the Hibernian Schools."

it mostly for the buildings of schools for the people. Froude writes of the Irish Catholic Schools of the 18th century:—"The Catholics, with the same steady courage and unremitting zeal with which they had maintained and multiplied the number of their priests, had established open schools in places like Killarney, where the law was a dead letter. In the more accessible counties, where open defiance was dangerous, they extemporised class teachers under ruined walls, or in the dry ditches by the road-side, where ragged urchins, in the midst of their poverty, learned English and the elements of arithmetic, and even to read and construe Ovid and Virgil. With institutions which showed a vitality so singular and so spontaneous, repressive Acts of Parliament contended in vain. . . . It was the boast of Protestantism that it was the religion of Intelligence. The hold of the priests—Protestant writers were never weary of repeating—was on the ignorance and superstition of their flocks. Yet the priests were caring more for knowledge than they, beating them on their own ground, and fighting them with their own weapons, of which they were neglecting the use."

The clergy, and those of the gentry and nobility who survived confiscation, were, for the most part, educated abroad, and were brought home after the manner of all contraband goods. Dean Herbert of Limerick, after having completed his education at one of the Continental Universities and become a priest, had himself stowed away in a barrel, was shipped back to Ireland and landed on Shannon's banks under the eyes of the Customs Officers as a harmless and legal article of commerce. And it is not so long ago; for he built St. Munchin's church in Limerick, in 1799. But the suppression of the Irish Colleges of France and the Low Countries during the Revolution, and the disturbed state of the Continent generally towards the close of the 18th

century, shut out Irish students in great measure from those opportunities. On the other hand, the dawn of liberty was breaking at home, prepared by the War of American Independence and heralded by the independence of the Volunteers. The first Relief Act was passed in 1793, and the Catholics of Ireland at once set about making provision for higher education at home. "On the Sunday when the news reached the city of Kilkenny, the bishop, Dr. Lanigan, held a public meeting in the chapel, and the immediate result was the opening of the Kilkenny College of Burrell's Hill. The College of Carlow was opened soon after."* Next came Maynooth in 1795, specially founded for the education of priests. The Bishops desired that the lay Catholics should also share its advantages, and a department for lay students was opened in 1801.† The Maynooth lay College was closed in 1817; for which the Bishops, of course, are blamed. They have been recently abused for that additional attempt to preclude the laity from enlightenment in order to crush their liberty. Dr. Starkie, hurried away on his hobby, thinks that having "no root-fibres in a system of primary and secondary schools, it soon languished and died." His account of the case is certainly more respectable than that which is given by those who allege, as one of the acts of episcopal injustice to the Irish Catholic laity, that they closed the lay College in Maynooth, and closed on the funds into the bargain. The truth is that when the lay College was opened, the Maynooth authorities were warned by the Government that it would not be sanctioned, inasmuch as it was against the original purpose of the College. Government was opposed to it

* "Progress of Catholicity in Ireland in the 19th century." Being a Paper read before the Catholic Congress of Mechlin, September, 1864. By Myles O'Reilly, B.A., LL.D., M.P.

† The late Sir Dominick Corrigan, the eminent physician, was, I believe, the last survivor of the lay students of Maynooth.

lest it should draw away Catholic students from Trinity College—the inspiration probably came from Trinity. Although it was officially stated in Parliament during the debate on the Maynooth Grant in 1845* that the Government, and not the Irish Bishops, caused the College to be closed, and although the full amount which the lay College had cost was then paid over by the ecclesiastical to the lay trustees, the calumny was too useful to be let die. If a story of that sort is to be spread and perpetuated, let it be committed to the care of "enlightened" folk with "liberal" minds, and it is sure to live and thrive; let it be crushed a hundred times, those apostles of fair play will revive it again. Such a story serves their purpose, and it is suro to be heeded by those who wish the case to have been as they say. According to the code of "broad-minded" morals, it seems to be quite justifiable to break the 8th Commandment on the head of a bishop or priest. I find in the work on Intermediate Education from which I have already quoted, that ten Intermediate Schools and Colleges were founded before 1829, in spite of the difficulties of the time; between 1829 and 1850, ten more Schools and Colleges were established, notwithstanding the distraction of the Repeal Movement; and between 1850 and 1872, when the work from which I quote was published, twenty-seven Schools and Colleges was established. The compilers of that work estimate the total cost of sites, the

* On April 18th, 1845, in the course of the Debate, Sir Robert Peel said: "We are told that this Institution of Maynooth is of a monastic and ascetic character. Whose fault is that? Not of the Roman Catholics. In 1795, at the institution of the College, Mr. Grattan presented a petition from the Roman Catholic body against that clause which prohibited the education of Protestants at Maynooth. The Trustees of Maynooth College were desirous of establishing a lay college. They did not wish it to be of an exclusive character. They were, however, interfered with and prevented, and Mr. Abbott informed the Secretary that the creation of a lay college would be contrary to the intentions of the Act; and in consequence of the intervention of the British Government it was prevented."

building of 47 Colleges from 1793 to 1872, at £362,750. I have not an estimate of what has been spent on Catholic Intermediate Schools and Colleges during the past thirty-three years; but several have been built. Thus the Catholics of Ireland, having sacrificed their possessions, their industries, their education, the land of their country, their liberty, thousands of them their lives—everything except their God, their faith, and their conscience; shut out from the use of civil rights and from the practice of skilled labour until only the tradition of technical industry remained, set to work the moment they were freed from their fetters, and have, out of their poverty and exclusively with their private resources, organised a system of Intermediate Education more complete and better, within the span of one century, than the Government through confiscation, monopoly, and public endowments has been able to do for its favourites in the span of three.

The Model Schools were, in their original purpose, part of a co-ordinated plan. They were meant to be Intermediate Schools to prepare the way for the Queen's Colleges, although they were established in connection with the National Schools, and are controlled by the Commissioners.

They cost no less than £500,000 to build and furnish. For more than two generations they have been carrying on their work at a cost of about £35,000 a year; at the time of the Powis Commission at any rate they had a teacher for every ten pupils; they have had the unspeakable advantage of being quite free from priestly interference or control; have never been under the shade of Catholic obscurantism; have been managed by a succession of Resident Commissioners, according to what Dr. Starkie would call the "independent and educated" lay mind; have been attended by the children of the well-off middle classes instead of by the children of

the poor for whom they were professedly intended—Well, what have they done? They have educated considerably less than 6,000 pupils in average annual attendance. A Resident Commissioner in 1866 gave as a reason why they should not be abolished, that "they are amongst the best examples in the world of sound secular instruction." They were glorified in the Inspectors' Reports and by the Board's officials generally. The people, accustomed as they had been, owing to non-Catholic privilege and to Catholic poverty and exclusion, to expect educational superiority from what was non-Catholic or secular, believed all they had heard or read of them. Who could doubt, after the Annual Reports of Commissioners, the highest official praises, Parliamentary assurances of excellence, that the Model Schools were all that they professed to be? or that the vast amount of public money they had cost was well and wisely spent? But those testimonies hardly rival the official praises of the old Charter Schools, and yet we know the revolting exposure which Mr. Howard and a Royal Commission made of these. Similarly, another Royal Commission came—the Powis Commission of 1869*—and left these official and Parliamentary praises of the Model Schools worth about as much as the Annual Report of a "Bird's Nest" belonging to the Irish Church Missions. Again, an Endowed School Commission was held in 1878-1880, of which the late Lord Randolph Churchill was a member. In 1884 the abolition of the Model Schools was proposed by the late Edmond Dwyer Gray, and they were defended by the Government. In the course of the Debate, Lord Randolph Churchill, speaking from the information which he had got during the Commission Enquiry, said, "If he (one of the Government Ministers) had not been hopelessly ignorant of these affairs, he would not have concealed from

* See Report, pages 456-459.

the Committee that these Model Schools are about the greatest imposture which could be kept up in Ireland." Let me test their educational condition by a comparison made from cold-blooded figures. Taking the ordinary National Schools, attended, often irregularly, by the children of the very poor in towns, and taught by nuns and monks, for six consecutive years (1885-1890), I find that their average per cent. of passes under the Results Examination was 89.45. I find that the average per-cent. of passes during the same years and under the same examination made by the Model Schools which are attended regularly by the children of the middle-classes was 89.08.* If I am told that these comparisons do not prove that these Convent and Monastery Schools are up to the best modern requirements, I reply that they are up to the requirements set before them by Government, and if those requirements be not high or progressive enough, let the blame rest on those who have framed the programme and forced it on the schools, not on the managers or the teachers who have to submit to it whether they approve it or not. These Catholic Poor Schools with all their hindrances, are nearer to the ideal set before them by Government authorities, than are the Model Schools with all their helps. That is my case. Can nothing better be done with these buildings which originally cost £500,000, and with that £35,000 a year which goes mostly to give free education to children who should pay for themselves, an education, moreover, which, if we are to judge by Royal Commissioners' Reports and by Examination Results, is inferior to that which is given in ordinary Primary Schools to the poorest of the poor by nuns and Christian Brothers, and by many lay teachers The pupils of the Model Schools could be easily accommodated in

* The respective percentages for each year will be found in the Chapter on Convent Teaching.

suitable schools already existing, and an educational outlet of more beneficial expenditure could be easily found for their annual cost.

Down to 1878 Catholic Intermediate Education was absolutely unendowed. There were endowments of Intermediate Education—and rich ones—but non-Catholics exclusively enjoyed them. In that year Earl Cairns introduced the Intermediate Education (Ireland) Bill, and it was without much difficulty passed into law. The sum of £1,000,000 out of the surplus fund of the Disestablished Church was set aside for the purpose. All Irish Intermediate Schools might win their share of the annual revenue which that capital afforded, according as each proved its efficiency in open competition. But the Catholic and the non-Catholic Schools entered the arena under widely different circumstances. The latter had their endowments, and a supposed educational superiority. The Catholic Schools had no endowments, and a supposed inferiority. The privilege of competing was simply given to them; that was all. The prestige of non-Catholic education had become a tradition in Ireland. Quite naturally. I have been told by some of those who were teaching in Catholic Schools at the time, that they sent their pupils to the first year's examinations with fear and trembling. But the result was a revelation. Their pupils left their competitors behind; and their victory, year by year ever since, has brought educational prestige over to their side. The Intermediate System has had this important effect: it has made Catholic teachers and pupils conscious of an educational superiority of which they were unconscious before. They have come to believe in themselves; and non-Catholics, amongst them Dr. Archdall the Protestant bishop of Killaloe, and Dr. Bunbury, Protestant bishop of Limerick, in his notorious Synodal Address three years ago, have openly admitted their superiority. The

system has this other important result: it is in principle a denominational system. The old subterfuge of refusing public money to denominational Colleges can be consistently resorted to no more. The principle of secularism has ceased to be sacred. Competitive tests have exploded its excellence; the legislature itself has relegated it to the past as a public principle. If I am reminded that the Intermediate system is educationally defective, that victory under it does not connote true educational efficiency, I readily assent. Public competition has its right place when one's education, such as it may be, is completed; but I think that introduced before that term it tends to vitiate the process of education. But here again, Catholics have not created the system; they have acepted it for want of better. They have gone into an arena not of their own choice, and they have come out with the laurels. If, therefore, Catholic Intermediate Schools be still said to have their shortcomings, let the blame be not put on them, but on the system under which they have to work. It is worthy of remark that the Christian Brothers' Schools, which are absolutely Catholic, are of admitted excellence. They have never come under the influence of Government officialdom, nor have they been originally designed under Government patronage, but precisely against it. Moreover, it is doubtful whether since they have partially changed their primary character and gone under the Intermediate System, they have maintained their general excellence as primary schools.

Let us now consider University education. As a Catholic nation, it is our anomalous fate to be acquainted with non-Catholic Universities only. Non-Catholic thought permeates our literature, science, and art. We have been reared in that atmosphere. As in our fathers' time, to speak of the gentry was to mean Protestants; so the delusion of identifying Protestantism

or secularism with University life came upon us also, and is living still—a lingering relic of the past. We have thus been brought by the force of circumstances to look on University life and the Catholic idea as almost incompatible. Little blame to us: we have been denied the opportunity and the right of witnessing in our midst the work of a Catholic University untrammelled by difficulties. It has been the persistent policy of our neighbours to represent the Catholic Church as the nurse of obscurantism. They first robbed, and then reviled her; and a few Catholics help to keep the illusion alive, forgetting that they are defaming their own mother and cutting their own throats. That was the condition of things before the Royal University came in 1879; but it is so no longer. The Royal University is not in strictness a University at all; it is simply an examining body. There can be no doubt that its Degrees require much more positive knowledge than those of Trinity College; nevertheless, many have obtained them by private study as well as those who have undergone a formal course of teaching; and anyone who has had experience in these things knows the difference which that makes in most cases. Trinity College gives Degrees to candidates from private study also.

As under the Intermediate System, so also in the Royal University, the Catholic Colleges had to enter the lists in their poverty, whilst the non-Catholic Colleges had their endowments. The three Queen's Colleges had been at work for thirty years. £100,000 of public money was originally spent on their buildings and equipment; and they enjoyed a revenue of £30,000 a year. In an able pamphlet published last year, Dr. Delaney, S.J.,* points out that "the estimates for the past three years, 1901-2-3, show that the total expenditure on the three Colleges in these years amounted respectively to £34,098, £34,916, and £34,966; and this

*A *Plea for Fair Play*: by Rev. Wm. Delaney, S.J.

last sum £34,966 is also the estimate for the current year 1903-4." Including the charge involved in the original outlay, the total cost to the taxpayer is £38,000 a year. The Catholic College had to compete against those three Colleges, with their endowments and their prestige, in which the education given, according to Dr. Johnstone Stoney, "aims at being the best which the twentieth century is able to develop."* Let us see some of the results. From the year 1884 to 1896, of the candidates from the Catholic University College, Dublin, who passed the B.A. Degree of the Royal University, 80.7 per cent. took Honours and Exhibitions; of those from Blackrock College, 92.5 per cent. took Honours and Exhibitions. On the other side, of those candidates from the Cork Queen's College, only 60.6 per cent. took Honours and Exhibitions; of those from the Galway Queen's College, 68.2 per cent. took Honours and Exhibitions. Again, from the year 1893 to 1900, in the medical examinations of the Royal University, the following shows the proportion of those who took Exhibitions to those who passed the examinations from the different Medical Schools—The Catholic University School of Medicine, 1:13—Queen's College, Belfast, 1:24—Queen's College, Cork, 1:21—Queen's College, Galway, 1:24.† I learn from Dr. Delaney's pamphlet that, from 1894 to 1903 inclusive, The Catholic University College obtained 374 First-class distinctions; the Queen's College, Belfast, 242; Queen's College, Galway, 86; Queen's College, Cork, 20. That is to say, it obtained 26 more than the three Queen's Colleges together; those wealthy Institutions which flower in the sunlight of secularism, without fear of Catholic blight. Of the Studentships (£300) in the same period, University College won 14; the three

* See his examination before the recent Royal Commission on University Education.

† Monsignor Molloy in the *I. E. Record*, Feb., 1902.

Queen's Colleges 13 (Belfast 10, Cork 2, Galway 1). In 1904 the Queen's College,Cork was beaten by half-a-dozen Catholic Colleges. The Queen's College, Galway, succeeded better than Cork, but was just ahead of one of the Convents. The Junior Fellowship in Mental and Moral Science went to the Dublin Diocesan Seminary. One student of the Catholic University School of Medicine competed for the Studentship in Pathology, and won it from the Queen's Colleges. That has happened on the last three consecutive occasions in spite of the poverty of the Catholic School of Medicine which leaves Dr. McWeeney, the Prof. of Pathology, under the disadvantage of teaching with an imperfectly equipped laboratory and in a miserable hall.

Whether Trinity College merits the traditional prestige which is attached to it in Ireland as a seat of learning, we have no such data for determining as the Royal University affords us in the case of the Queen's Colleges. I say, its prestige in Ireland, because outside Ireland it has no prestige. Whilst the Queen's Colleges stood out in academical aloofness, a prestige was carefully manufactured for them, and they enjoyed it. It was easy; for in those days the mere name of a secular or non-Catholic College at once secured a prestige of academical superiority in Ireland. Then came the Royal University system which put that prestige to proof by competition, and the prestige proved to be but a bubble. When the bubble was blown off the prestige at once collapsed, and although attempts to revive it have often been made, it has never risen again. That event makes one reflect whether the prestige which Trinity College still enjoys in Ireland may not be an air-bubble also. One thing is, I believe, certain about that Institution; it is the richest College in Europe. It owns 200,000 acres of land confiscated in Munster and Ulster, besides other considerable sources of income. Its total annual revenue

is variously estimated. At any rate, is is enormous. All its revenue is derived from Irish sources, and mostly all from Catholic sources. It has been enjoying its wealth since the 16th century, and one may be excused for enquiring in the 20th century what has it done for Ireland? What value has it given for its wealth? Its apologists are fond of reminding Irish Catholics in proof of its tolerant tendency always, that it opened its doors to them so long ago as 1793. In any case, that would not be so much the sign of a liberal spirit as of an awakening sense of justice, since it was subsisting on Catholic resources, and Catholics were the vast majority of the nation. The great function of a University claiming to be National is to leaven the nation as a whole, not a favoured fraction of the people. But, setting that consideration aside, Trinity College deserves no credit for that partial concession of right; the privilege came from the Relief Act of 1793. It rather showed its intolerance by restricting the privilege as much as possible. For instance, it was doubtful whether that Act made Catholics eligible for Scholarships. In 1843, Denis Caulfield Heron, afterwards a well-known Catholic lawyer, competed for a Scholarship, thinking he was eligible. He won it by examination, but was denied it because he was a Catholic, and of course had not been registered for attendance at the University chapel. If Trinity College was liberally disposed, even so late as sixty years ago, it would have given him the benefit of the doubt, since there was a doubt. Quite otherwise was its disposition. According to Mr. Heron, "it had the honour of causing the last of the Penal Laws to be enacted, and it still remains unrepealed. It was passed in a late year, too, being 1808."* Not until 1873 were Catholics made eligible for Scholarships and other privileges of the University. Dr. Stoney, in his evidence

* *Constitutional History of Trinity College*, by D. C. Heron, 1845.

before the recent University Commission, spoke of that as the concession of "a most reasonable Catholic claim." But such liberal acknowledgements have one drawback: they are made in the 20th century. The concession would have come better, had it come towards the close of the 18th century, or even in the middle of the 19th, when Mr. Heron won his Scholarship. The concession was made, it is worthy of remark, when Trinity College was threatened by Mr. Gladstone's University Bill with a loss of its monopoly, besides £12,000 a year of its revenue. Since 1873, other influences have softened it unto generosity towards Catholics. The Degrees of the Royal University kept away many students who would otherwise have entered Trinity; many who can afford the cost, pass its doors, notwithstanding its alleged prestige, and go to Oxford, Cambridge, and elsewhere. The number of its students has been steadily lessening for years, and to an alarming extent. Other clouds also have been gathering over it which, had it not been kept exempt from the enquiry of the recent University Commission, might have poured down their contents and drowned its prestige in the deluge. Such circumstances will hardly let the public allow its latest claim for liberality towards Catholics on the ground that it has within the past year founded new Exhibitions specially for their sake. I cannot say if it pretends that it was a liberal inspiration moved it to grant its Degrees lately to a galaxy of girls who had made their studies in Oxford and Cambridge, passed the necessary examinations, but could not get their Degree, since lady graduates are not admitted in those two Institutions. They lost about £1,500 by their academic fastidiousness, which Trinity College gained as fees by its academic facility. About the concessions which Trinity College has from time to time made to Catholics it is a remarkable circumstance that after

they were made it was a most reasonable thing to have claimed them, before they were made it was monstrous to expect them; and they have always been made under circumstances which suggest the hope of gain or the fear of loss.

Mr. Heron, in the chapter of his book from which I have already quoted records the nickname "silent sister" by which Trinity College has been known across the Channel, and he refers to "the fewness of distinguished names which shine forth as stars from out its long list of lettered obscurity." It is right to remember that, since Trinity did not show itself a true *Alma Mater* to him, he, whilst the sense of unfairness was fresh in him, probably did not write its history as an enthusiastic son, nor possibly as a quite dispassionate historian. One may dispute his opinions, but one cannot deny his facts. However, the following testimony as to the prestige of Trinity College abroad is from a singularly dispassionate witness, and it was written, moreover, in connection with another and a very important subject. When Cardinal Newman was casting about for a professorial staff for the Catholic University, he wrote to Cardinal Cullen on 14th August, 1852:—"Professors *of name*, not merely able men, are absolutely necessary. *What* is our bait for students to come to us? We have no direct temporal motives; we have the weight of Government against us; we must have *names*; Trinity College, the Queen's Colleges, have, I doubt not, able Professors, but they have not *names*; I doubt if they have any, or more than one or two, whose names are known out of Ireland. It will be a great thing, for the success of the Institution, to get Professors whose names are known to the Continent, to the world."

The means of measuring the value of the teaching and the Degrees of Trinity College by any recognised academic

standard are very scant; for by pleading its venerable age and plaintively pointing to the hoary walls that guard it, those who direct the destiny of that Institution have always succeeded in shielding it both from public inspection and from academic comparison with other teaching Institutions in Ireland. In that it has been more fortunate than the Queen's Colleges. The General Medical Council is, so far as I am aware, the only outside authority which has any power of inquiry; and I take the following from its Report of 1886*:—"We feel bound to state that our joint opinion is, that the Examination for the Degree of Bachelor of Medicine in the University of Dublin is inadequate for a degree admitting to the *Medical Register*; and that the candidates were not sufficiently tested in Medicine, Surgery, and Midwifery, inasmuch as there was no *viva voce* or practical examination in Pathology, Surgery, Obstetrics, or Medical Jurisprudence." They add that, with the exception of the specially medical portion and that in Psysiological Anatomy, "in all the other departments the Examination was unworthy of a University Degree, and insufficient for a Registrable Qualification."

"Those who succeed in passing the Examination for the M.B. of Dublin University are not only admitted to the *Medical Register*, and have thus conferred on them all the rights and privileges of registered medical practitioners, but they may also become the happy possessors of a University Degree, which is usually regarded as a higher qualification than a mere licence admitting to the *Register*. The University of Dublin itself does not, however, take this view. The University requires for its mere licence that the candidate should pass through the same medical curriculum, and undergo the same Examination as those more fortunate men who obtain its higher

* The Minutes of the General Medical Council for the year, 1886; Vol. XXIII., pp. 342, 343, 344. Spottiswood & Co.

qualification or Degree. The only difference between the Licentiates, or simple pass men, of the Dublin University and its Graduates, is merely this, the Licentiates have had only a two-years' course in Arts, while the Graduates have passed through the full course of four years, and have also obtained the degree of B.A. A mere Licentiate in Medicine may become a Graduate at once, without any further Medical Examination, by completing the four years' curriculum in Arts, obtaining the B.A., and paying a small fee. I suppose there is no other University, or even Licensing Body, in the Kingdom that occupies a position so anomalous, or that grants its own Higher Qualification for attainments in a totally different Faculty." Until I read this Report I had thought that the Rule of the Dublin University making students with a B.A. Degree only eligible for Degrees in Medicine meant that one should have obtained his B.A. before going through the curriculum for the Degree in Faculty. But it appears from the Report that the two courses may run concurrently, and we can thus measure the educational value of the B.A. Degree of Trinity College. What follows in the Report gives us a more concrete measure of it:—"The system of permitting the education for the B.A. to be continued simultaneously with that for M.B. is most unwise, and cannot but be injurious to both. So far as could be ascertained, it is accompanied by no compensatory advantage whatever. Any Bachelor of Arts might surely be expected to understand the spelling and grammatical construction of a simple Latin prescription, while a very limited knowledge of Botany and Chemistry ought to be sufficient to prevent any glaring mistakes in the nomenclature of substances in ordinary use. And for a B.A. to write *Uncias sextos, Drachmas quattuor, Tussu urgente,* and other similar absurdities, is surely intolerable. . . . However desirable it may be for a University Graduate

in Medicine to be also a Graduate in Arts, it is surely not worth while running the risk of starving the medical education for the sake of such a limited knowledge of the Literæ Humaniores as is shewn in the examples given."

With such a Report before him, the following observations of Dr. Laffan cannot be thought too strong:—"It passes comprehension, that Graduates of this University are so scandalously ignorant of the very rudiments of Latin as is disclosed by the Visitors' Report. So long as the M.B. was palmed off on the public for something that it is not, it seemed anomalous to admit the mere Licentiates of this University to the M.B. Degree; but now that the cat is out of the bag the seeming anomaly disappears. . . . The writer of this paper has more than once anticipated the Visitors as to the value of Trinity College Degrees. When he considered the number of stupid and idle youths that one meets with, he was often astonished how it was possible that these creatures could master both the Arts and the Medical Curricula simultaneously. Either would give smart and industrious youths enough to do. The suspicion crossed my mind that the whole thing must be a sham and a fraud, and something very like a sham and a fraud these Visitors now declare it to be." *

In a similar Essay, to which The Carmichael Prize was awarded also in 1879, Dr. Laffan writes:—"Most of us have great ideas about the value of Trinity College—its examinations and its teaching. . . . Well, Mr. M'Namara, at a late meeting of the General Medical Council, brought under notice a remarkable correspondence between his College and one of the officials of Trinity College which must rudely dispel our illusions as to the value of the examinations of the latter place.

* The Medical Profession in the Three Kingdoms in 1887. The Essay to which was awarded the Carmichael Prize of £100 by the Council of the Royal College of Surgeons, Ireland, 1887. By Thomas Laffan, M.C.P.I., Cashel; pp. 288, 289.

The Irish College of Surgeons is a respectable Body, but it does not affect to exact more than a moderate examination. The correspondence disclosed the extraordinary fact that a youth, whose information was so poor that even the well-known pity which his examiners must have felt for the oft-rejected tyro was insufficient to put him over the stile, was, nevertheless, able to pass in flying colours over the preliminary barrier with which Trinity guards the entrance to our Profession. Explanations were, of course, in abundance; but all the explanations in the world will not get rid of the fact that the reputedly most respectable Body in the country passed a candidate who had been again and again rejected by another whose examination does not pretend to be very strict." †

I call another witness to the academic requirements of Trinity College—namely, Trinity itself. We have recently seen placed before the youth of Ireland by the Board of Trinity College the offer of valuable Entrance Scholarships to be awarded to them as the result of the Intermediate Examinations, without further test. This offer enables us to measure with considerable accuracy the standards of Trinity College, compared with those of the Royal University. These New Scholarships, be it noted, are offered not only to Exhibitioners of the Senior Grade, but also to those of the Middle Grade; that is, to boys of sixteen, and not unfrequently of fifteen years of age, who have not yet completed the ordinary school course. We are bound to presume that the Board of Trinity College, in offering such inducements to those brilliant boys of that age to enter Trinity College, consider that they are already fitted to follow with due profit the courses of the University. If they are not thus qualified—that is, if the standard of Honours in the Junior Freshman year is notably higher than that of

† Pages 134, 135.

the Senior Grade to which they would have passed if they remained at school—then the Board of Trinity College, in inducing them to enter that Institution, will have seriously injured the educational career of these young students. In the Royal University, it has been found by experience that students have little or no chance of distinguishing themselves at Matriculation in the year of the Senior Grade. Hence, with hardly an exception, it will be found that students who win distinctions in that University, have taken, at least, one, and often two and even three years, after passing the Senior Grade, before presenting themselves for Matriculation. I confirm my words by facts. From 1890-1900, out of 297 candidates who won Exhibitions on matriculating in the Royal University, 257 had passed the Senior Grade; but *only one* of the 257 presented himself in the same year for Matriculation; and though that *one* had been 1st in the Senior Grade, he obtained only 20th place in the Matriculation. After their Senior Grade course, 218 took one year to prepare for Matriculation; 31 took two years; and many of these had been amongst the first in their Senior Grade Examinations. The rest of the 257 took three or more years before presenting themselves for Matriculation. Now, what places would those new and ready-made Scholars of Trinity be likely to win in such a competition, offering themselves direct from the Middle Grade? And yet, Trinity College now accepts those Middle Grade Honours as in themselves qualifying, not for mere Matriculation there, but for valuable Scholarships. Here we have given to us by the Board of Trinity College itself, a fair test as to the Comparative standards of Entrance Scholarships at that Institution, and at the Royal University. The Bishop of Killaloe, in one of his replies to addresses, called this new inducement "sublimated Souperism." He has been blamed for the term. But is it incorrect? At any rate,

it looks very like holding out a bribe to promising boys to leave school in the middle of their school course in order to enter Trinity College, from which they will come out full fledged Graduates at the age of nineteen.

Another basis of comparison is afforded by the success of the University College and Trinity College respectively in passing candidates into the Home and Indian Civil Service. I happen to have before me the results of those Examinations for 1898 and 1901. In those two years, five candidates from the University College were successful, and eleven from Trinity College. We cannot draw any comparative conclusion from the difference in the number of successes, since it might be accounted for by the difference in the number of students in each of those two Institutions. But we can draw a conclusion as to the quality of teaching from the quality of the places obtained by their respective condidates; and I find that those from the University College obtained on an average 34th place, whilst those from Trinity College obtained on an average 72nd place. The well-guarded privileges of Trinity shut us out from better grounds of comparison; but those we have enlighten us a good deal to its disadvantage.

The late Prof. Fitzgerald, one of the ablest men whom Trinity College has produced for a long time, addressed a Report in December, 1898, to the Senate of Dublin University, from which I take the following:—

"When I was re-elected a member of the University Council in 1894, the Council was letting drop a scheme of agricultural education for students of the University. The scheme then brought forward, though not involving any serious outlay on the part of the University, included provision for the teaching of the Sciences and other subjects that are required by a person who intends to engage in the profession of agriculture. It proposed to utilise the Model Farm at Glasnevin in somewhat the

same way as hospitals are at present used by the School of Medicine, and it provided a Scientific Course within the College. The ostensible reason, and indeed the only one that I could discover, for the reluctance to recommend the scheme to the Board was the possibility that it might lead to further expenses. One cannot, however, help feeling regret that an effort to extend the usefulness of the University in a direction which would be of service to the country, and which has been recognised as part of their functions by so many other great Universities, including Oxford and Cambridge, was treated with apathy by the University of Dublin.

"In February, 1895, a resolution in reference to another important advance in the usefulness of the University was carried. It was as follows:—'That it is desirable that the University of Dublin provide courses of instruction and examinations suitable for those who intend to take up the profession of teaching, and that a committee be appointed to consider how this can best be done.' . . . The want of interest in Ireland in educational questions is largely due to the want of interest felt in them by the University of Dublin, which has not followed the example of most other Universities in providing at least a lecturer on this important subject. . . . It must, however, be recollected that the funds at the disposal of the University are very limited. The endowment of the University of Dublin and Trinity College is not more than about one-eighth part as great as that of either Oxford or Cambridge with their Colleges. . . . Unless the Graduates of the University and the people of Ireland provide the necessary funds for developing the University of Dublin in accordance with the needs of the present day, it must sink into almost insignificance in comparison with its enormously developed rivals.

"When the great and well-supported Science Schools, which must, no doubt, be founded in Dublin within the next few years, in obedience to the requirements of modern technical education, are in existence, the really deplorable character of many of the scientific departments of Trinity College will be obvious to all, and no student will run the risk of having to study science under such auspices. Why should not the University of Dublin provide the highest class of education? Why should we not provide for historical research, for art, for agriculture, mechanical science, like Cambridge; for commercial education, like Leipsig; for textile and dyeing education, like Leeds; for psychological research, and for education in how to teach, like so many Universities all over the world? Because we have no funds for all these things. We do not even work our present functions respectably."

Two things appear on the face of that Report—a confession of failure, and a complaint of poverty! Passing from its mere teaching functions, if we want to know its general educational influence over the country we look for the distributing channels of that leavening influence to the Protestant gentry, and in general to that class who might have been trained in Trinity. And what do we find? I refer the reader for an answer to an article on the subject which Prof. Mahaffy, himself one of the dons of Trinity, contributed to the *Contemporary Review* for January, 1882. It saves me an ungracious work in which I may be suspected of prejudice. Its influence on Catholics who have passed through it I can speak of more freely; and I adopt the description given of it by a very distinguished Catholic layman, Dr. W. K. Sullivan, who succeeded Sir Robert Kane in the Presidency of the Queen's College, Cork. Speaking of the revival of middle-class society in Ireland,

he writes*:—"Its growth is an evidence of the wonderful recuperative power of the Irish people, and a promise of still better things in the future. A society like that of the Irish middle class, which has no traditional culture, which has not had the advantages which spring from centres of intellectual thought, and whose educational institutions have grown up so rapidly, must possess all the defects of new societies; while the peculiar circumstances of Ireland have not been favourable to the development of the corresponding virtues. Foremost among these virtues should be a love of truth and self-assertion. In a country which may be said to have no aristocracy, and yet the current of whose life is nevertheless eminently aristocratic, newly enriched Catholics strive by every means to become "respectable." The most prominent indication of this quality in society is the fear to express any opinion which would indicate a political or a religious faith, or indeed, independent thought upon anything. . . . We have seen that the majority of Catholic barristers have been educated in Trinity College. The education which a Catholic could receive there is not likely to develop those higher qualities in which our new society is so deficient. I have already stated that Trinity College could not perform the functions of an educational brain for an intermediate education. It is, if possible, still less adapted to perform the function of intellectual centre for Catholic society. Is the intellectual life which it transmits to Catholic society through its Catholic students, in harmony with the religious and moral constitution of that society? It could not be. The Catholic student of Trinity is an intellectual pauper, admitted by suffrance to its halls. He is offered the mental food prepared for its true students, whose constitution it suits, whose minds thrive upon it, and who

* *University Education in Ireland: A Letter to Sir John Dalberg Acton, Bart.*, 1866.

become self-reliant men, whose opinions, even when prejudiced, are their own. But how can he assimilate what must be unsuited for his constitution? The tone of the place is not only Protestant, but its moral and intellectual atmosphere is pervaded by a spirit of ascendancy, which must be eminently disagreeable to high-minded Catholic gentlemen. Catholics may, and as a matter of fact, do pass through it without loss of faith; but with this I do not concern myself. I refer to the moral and intellectual action of the place, which I believe to be good upon Protestants, but which fundamentally changes the mode of thought of the Catholic student. I do not object to intellectual influence upon men's minds; it is one of the most important agents of education, and Universities are among its best instruments. But in order that its action may be healthy and invigorating, should it not be entramelled? Are the positions of the Protestant and Catholic students of Trinity College, in respect to the intellectual influence of their teachers, alike? The one can accept all their teaching unreservedly; the other can only accept the part timidly, while he must forego another part. His early ideas must be in perpetual conflict with his later teaching, and instead of developing his mind according to its natural law of evolution, and boldly discussing the problems of philosophy, he becomes suspicious of their tendency and weakly sceptical, without having pased through the mental process which makes philosophical sccpticism at least honest; he loses enthusiasm for intellectual truth, for his mind has never enjoyed the liberty through which alone it can be recognised. This is the typical pseudomorphic Englishman; his mind has the outward form and mould of the natural man, but the internal structure is wanting. The issue of a new society which has risen to wealth amidst the misery and discontent of the majority of their co-religionists,

and educated in an atmosphere to which they could only become acclimatized by the sacrifice of their intellectual individuality, Catholic lawyers cannot be expected to judge of political questions according to rigid principles. They are therefore the fit representatives of a society, whose only aim is 'respectability.' . . . For a long time past the redress of Irish grievances has meant simply the bestowal of places upon lawyers. The influence exerted by all these legitimate and illegitimate places upon the legal professions is marked by the production of a peculiar code of social ethics. Among those who aspire to 'respectability,' the chief qualification for any office is freedom from any strong belief in anything. To possess this quality is to be 'liberal-minded' and 'educated.' The possession of a belief—but above all, its expression, however moderate—not only disqualifies in their opinion the unfortunate believer himself, but compromises all his friends. In order to prevent society, in its exclusive sense, from becoming tainted by so dreadful a disease as independent thought, it is called by some hard name, and every effort made to isolate it and stamp it out." Instead of offering a criticism of my own I have quoted those passages as the opinion of one of the ablest laymen, of any class or creed, whom Ireland produced during the 19th century. The reader will be able to judge from his experience if they are a true picture of the case, a correct diagnosis of the social disease which Catholics run the risk of contracting in Trinity. In the course of his lengthy letter Dr. Sullivan deals with the position of another type of "Catholic" in the person of a "barrister and a graduate of Trinity College" who had published a pamphlet on "Freedom of Education" which professed to voice the opposition of "dissentient Catholics" to a proposed measure which would give some recognition to the work of the Catholic University. The pamphlet protested against the

design of placing the higher education of the people of Ireland in the hands of "the emissaries of Italian fanaticism." In the name of enlightened Catholics, the some writer published a little book in 1872—"Catholicism and the Vatican"—in which he repudiated Papal Infallibility; that is, two years after it had been defined as an article of Catholic faith by the Vatican Council. I make that reference in order to point out, prescinding from the value of the doctrine, the consistency of that "Catholic," and the enlightenment he enjoyed. He wrote as a Catholic, thought he was still a Catholic, whilst he repudiated an Article of Faith. Of such kind is the Catholic education which one naturally brings from an Institution where Catholic teaching is never taught. Natural politeness, or a pervading religious indifference may save one from insult, offensive epithets, or from aggression of any sort; but there is nothing to save one from that queer condition in which one is so ignorant of Catholic principles that he does not know whether he is a Catholic or not; or worse still, thinks he is a Catholic when he has unknown to himself ceased to be one. Dr. Sullivan observes "that the liberal Catholic party is very large in Ireland—it embraces nearly the whole Catholic body. But that party is not represented by the writer and his co-dissentients. Let me further add, that when Irish Catholic liberalism shall be represented by such as he, it will be a misfortune for Ireland and a serious loss to the English liberal party."* Later on† he says that statesmen "take this pseudo-Catholic opinion as the real opinion of the country, because it is the only one with which they come into contact. When the present Sir Robert Peel came to Ireland he must have heard the hum of the "dissentient" Catholics around him, announcing to him that

* Preface, page 4.

† Pages 32, 33, 34.

he had only to appeal to the educated classes of the country, and he would get such an expression of opinion as would crush the growing "ultramontanism" for ever. Sir Robert, believing that the establishment of the Queen's Colleges was a great benefit conferred by his father on Ireland, bethought him of using them as a test of Irish public opinion. With this view he generously offered to found for ten years, three scholarships, of the value of £40 each, to be held each for one year. This offer was of course gladly accepted, as it really deserved to be, by the Senate of the Queen's University; and the example thus set was followed, as it was intended to be, by a movement to raise subscriptions for the endowment of other Scholarships. This surely was a favourable opportunity for the "dissentient" Catholic element to show forth its real strength, and confirm the prevalent idea that all educated Catholic opinion was in favour of "United" education—a happy phrase which some cunning man invented to express the true condition of the Queen's Colleges—students of different religions united under teachers belonging to one. A Committee was formed. On this Committee there is not the name of a single Catholic; not a representative of that "dissentient" element, anxious to prove his independence of all sectarian prejudices. The address issued by the Committee was, one would suppose, well suited to elicit the support of that numerous class of Catholic "dissenters" and opponents of "Ultramontanism," which we are told exists in Ireland. This appeal realized £8,749, besides £125 a year during the life of the donors, or until further notice. . . . . About one-half of it was subscribed by English noblemen and gentlemen, either wholly unconnected with Ireland, or permanent absentees, English officials in Ireland, Professors and officers in the Queen's Colleges and the Government schools, Irish subordinate officials,

and a few Protestant clergymen. As regards its real object, the eliciting Catholic opinion and support in favour of the Queen's Colleges, it was not only a failure, but brought forth one of the most remarkable protests from the Irish Catholics, and in which more than two hundred Peers, Members of Parliament, Magistrates, etc., joined. . . . The total Catholic subscriptions contributed—subscribed by forty-two individuals, amounted to £385 2s. 0d. and £15 a year during the life of the donors, of which £170 5s. 0d. was subscribed by ten Catholic officials; and even of this small sum, £145 came from six professors and officers of the Queen's Colleges, leaving the munificent sum of £25 5s. 0d. as the total subscription of all the Catholic officials of Ireland, not directly connected with the Queen's Colleges. Of the small sum of £212 and £15 a year, a portion was subscribed anonymously, and may, for aught I know, be an official subscription, and the larger portion by persons whose motives might not be uninfluenced by some of those agreeable favours it is in the power of a Government to bestow, such as a High Sheriffship. The same year in which this subscription was raised, the Catholics contributed to the Catholic University of Ireland £8,677, besides £200 per annum for ten years, raised by the Catholics of the city and county of Limerick, and the munificent subscription of the late John Connolly, Esq., of £100 per annum for ten years, to found Scholarships therein, as answers to Sir Robert Peel's challenge." But the principles of those "liberal" folk are always better expressed by the tongue than by the purse. It is one of their peculiarities that their principles never lead them towards sacrifice, but always tend towards social or financial gain.

The revenue of Trinity College is a public trust for

higher education in Ireland. What that revenue is, and how it is managed, I will let Mr. Howley tell.*

"The Senior Fellows of Trinity College are not the proprietors, but only the stewards and trustees of the public endowment; and it follows that if those stewards are found to have managed the national property unfaithfully, they may justly be deprived of their stewardship, and more responsible persons may be appointed in their stead. The Commission of 1853 reported that the estates of Trinity College comprised over 200,000 acres of land, valued at £92,000 a year; but that the actual rental and renewal fines only produced £34,000 per annum. The value of the property ought now to be near £108,000; but it seems the receipts have only reached £37,000. Mark well, every friend of integrity, that the difference between the value and the rental of th lands has arisen from the mismanagement, and I believe I must say, the misappropriation of the Senior Fellows. The Report of 1853 admits 'that leases have been usually granted on payment of fines, at a rent considerably below the true value.' Why? Is there any clue to this fraud on the public endowment? Let the Report speak, and give the reason for this masked peculation. 'Because,' says the Report, 'the fines were distributed amongst the Provost and Senior Fellows, as part of their respective incomes.' And twenty years ago, Parliament interfered, and a Royal letter bought off those customary delinquents, the Provost and Senior Fellows, by allowing them to 'receive £800 a year each, out of the general funds of the College, in lieu of their share of the fines.' The contrast between the value and the rental of the College estates makes manifest to what an extent the Fellows neglected their trust to set the lands at the utmost improved rents—

* "The Universities and Secondary Schools of Ireland." By Edward Howley, Esq., of the Middle Temple, B.L. Simpkin, Marshall & Co., London, 1871. pp. 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 47.

nay, at half the yearly value. On a valuation inquiry made by order of the House of Commons in 1799, it transpired that part of the College estate in the City of Dublin was valued at £3,316 a year, but that it had been leased for thirty-three years to the Protestant Bishop of Raphoe at £400 a year.* The historian of the College says, this was done 'by some great oversight.' . . . Is it not true of the Senior Fellows, as of the Protestant Bishops, that for their own selfish ends they have given leases to strangers for a fine, though, perhaps, not to relatives or dependants without a fine? Whether by avaricious self-seeking or venal compliances, it is clear that they have frittered away half of the national fund for University education; and the State must now ask them, like the Protestant Bishops, to give up their stewardship over public endowments. It is time to limit the avarice of a University body that has broken its trust, and has practically diverted large estates from their original use to support sinecures and to aggrandise families. . . . The Commissioners of 1853 reported that 'the fees on degrees should, we think. be discontinued; as it is objectionable to have any portion of the income of the members of the Board so directly connected with the exercise of an impotant power entrusted to them.' Reason was on the point of gaining a victory over excessive charges, when self-interest brought up a reinforcement; and the Fellows pleading that degrees would not be valuable which did not cost money, the fees were retained for the general purposes of the College. How little benefit the public had derived from the mode in which the fees for degrees used to be appropriated by the Fellows, may be judged from the fact that the Commissioners of 1853 stated that the income of the Junior Proctor, arising chiefly from fees on the degree of B.A.,

* D. C. Heron's *University of Dublin*, page 107.

amounted to £900 a year; in return for which he vouchsafed to perform 'nominal duties.' Mr. Mahaffy, the latest apologist for Trinity College, is candid enough to admit that there are "some useless offices which should be abolished." . . . I shall arraign and condemn Trinity College, out of the mouth of her own spokesman. We are informed by Mr. Mahaffy, in the *Fortnightly Review*, that the thirty-three Fellows of Trinity College are not voracious when they take £27,000, in the shape of students' fees, as this large sum represents the earnings of the Fellows by teaching; but the £27,000 not being enough to pay them for managing as well as teaching, they, in addition, help themselves to £11,800 out of the annual revenue of the College. And yet, the Fellows who have thus divided amongst themselves nearly £39.000 a year for the duties of teaching and managing, find it necessary to employ Professors at a cost of £6,000 to aid them to do one of the duties, for which they have already paid themselves so handsomely. ". . . It seems to me a great scandal, and a violation of decency and common sense that the Fellows should pay themselves out of a public endowment, at their own valuation of their services; and it seems to me a greater scandal, if possible, that they should drive a roaring trade in Examinations. They appropriate to themselves an enormous income derived from the fees of students; and thus it happens that they have a strong interest in not making examinations too difficult—the rugged heights of Parnassus are made smooth that the climbing students may pay their fees with alacrity and patience. The passing of examinations has too near an approach to the reality of a money bargain. . . . When even they, who have been nurtured at Trinity College, who have shared its emoluments, and gained its honours, revolt at the system of distributing the College funds; are those Irishmen who are practically excluded from the

University to assume an air of content and resignation? I could speak of several agitations among the scholars to obtain increased rewards for talent; but discontent has still reached a higher sphere, and the power of the Board has been wielded to put down incipient mutiny among the Junior Fellows. An unjust monopoly fears exposure, trembles at publicity, and welcomes only a mellifluous commission or a friendly visitation. The Board in 1858 censured and silenced two of the Junior Fellows, who sought to expose the abuses of the College in the public Press; and the censure upon one of the Fellows was confirmed on an appeal to the visitation body of the University. It seems that the condemned Junior Fellow was guilty of a breach of discipline, when he publicly alleged that the Board distributed the revenues of the College in a manner opposed to the interests of education; and he also appears not to have reflected that once a use is ever a custom—and that the Board, by long enjoying fees, acquire a right to enjoy them; but the merits of a technical dispute waged before a domestic tribunal are not the merits of a public question, which appeals to the entire country for sympathy and support, and to Parliament for redress and justice. The Junior Fellows have been silenced in their complaints; but the Catholics of Ireland shall not wear a padlock on their lips. Let not the Senior Fellows dream they have for ever silenced discord in the spheres; there are thunder-clouds drifting towards them, and when the storm has burst their monopoly shall be swept away, and the genius of free education shall stand unstained by condoned corruption, unswayed by religious rancour."

Our only experience of Catholic Universities in Ireland has not been, it is true, an experience of success; once in the 17th century, and again in the 19th. No wonder these attempts more or less failed; the most

lasting purpose they could in their circumstances have served was a national protest against educational wrong. Our circumstances have brought us to associate Protestanism or secularism with higher education as ideas which naturally blend, and, as if against our instincts, to consider Catholic faith and higher education incompatible. It is one of the remaining relics of our past disabilities; marks of slavery which are not yet quite healed, though the chains which made them have been cast off. We have kept the faith; we glory in the sacrifices it has cost, and we would, if necessary, make them all over again for its sake; and yet we hesitate to claim for it a foremost place in the movement of natural enlightenment. Our religious instinct recoils from non-Catholicism under any form, from High Church to No Church, and yet it is associated in our thoughts with educational and social superiority. It is a feeling which must have an injurious influence on us, since it connects intellectual stagnation with religious truth, and what is progressive in reason with what is false in faith. For the impression itself we rather deserve praise, since it is a record of sacrifice for principle and conscience; the blame lies with those who have withheld from us the opportunity and the right of witnessing in our midst the influence and the work of a Catholic University duly chartered and sufficiently endowed. The Catholic University founded in Dublin by the Irish Bishops in 1854 did not realise their hopes, nor yet has it been quite a failure. I cannot paint the light and the shadow better than in this lengthy passage which I borrow from a Lecture delivered before the Catholic Graduates' Association, on the 10th of last February by Dr. Sigerson, F.R.U.I., who spoke from personal knowledge:—"The method of carrying out the project was such and so wise that, had it obtained due recognition, it would have placed their (the bishops')

conduct above all carping. It has been constantly alleged that the aim of the Irish bishops was to make the University an engine of clerical domination over the laity. If they had desired that they need never have striven as champions of lay education. What was their course upon the present occasion? They went outside their rank, and even outside their country to seek for and gain the one most capable man perhaps in the world as a University head, Dr. John Henry Newman. They undertook the responsibilities of financing the Institution; they gave him charge to draw up a Constitution. A prompt and generous response met their appeal for funds, over £58,000 being contributed in five years, of which sum one-fourth came from the exiled Irish in the United States and elsewhere.* From the

*In Dr. Sigerson's estimate of the share which those outside Ireland had in the financial support of the University for the first five years, there is an oversight which it is only fair to correct. Outsiders took a more generous part than he assigns to them. The whole amount received within that time (1854-1859) was £58,071 1s. 5d. (which, however, includes £3,746 18s. 0d. interest received on stock, £5,000 received through Cardinal Cullen from one anonymous benefactor, and £271 from another). Of that sum, £21,437 2s. 7d. came from abroad. The amount of money altogether received for the University is variously estimated, and sometimes extravagantly so. For some years money flowed in fast, expecting Government recognition; but, later on, when that hope was fading, money came in slowly. The following few estimates which I give from persons once closely connected with the Institution, may be of interest:— Dr. W. K. Sullivan, Professor of Chemistry at the University, and afterwards President of the Cork Queen's College, stated, in 1866, that the amount contributed up to that time was £130,000. According to Mr. Howley, the amount collected up to the time he wrote (1871) was £150,000. According to the Committee of Irish Catholics who compiled the work on "Intermediate Education," published in 1872, from which I have already quoted, up to that time £150,000 had been received. Dr. R. D. Lyons, Professor of Pathology at the University, in a pamphlet on "The Intellectual Resources of Ireland," published in 1873, tells us that the work of the University was then carried on "on a limited scale of expenditure of about £6,000 a year." From "*A Report on the Condition and Circumstances of the Catholic University of Ireland, Presented by a Committee of the Senate, July*, 1859," I learn that its annual cost at that time was "something less than £8,000 a year";

17th March, 1851 to the end of December, 1865; that is, in less than fourteen years, the large amount of £120,000 had been received, almost exclusively from annual collections in Ireland. With respect to its Constitution, it should be necessary to state, considering who the author was, that it was based on large and liberal lines, in the spirit of the older Universities. There were five Faculties, the Professors of each meeting to transact business, and to appoint a Dean annually. The Deans of Faculties and the Vice-Rector, with three additional members of the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters (having one vote) constituted a Rectorial Council, to advise monthly. Against two-thirds of its vote the Rector could do no public act. Above this was the Senate, composed of Vice-Rector and Secretary, the Professors, the Heads and Tutors of Collegiate Houses, and the Fellows of the University, convoked and presided over by the Rector. In his nomenclature, the term Fellow is equivalent to M.A. His entire plan vibrated with the vigour of the higher mental life, and stands as an exemplar of a broad and deep academic structure. It was sanctioned by the Irish bishops, as was his opinion—'I think nearly all the Professors had better be laymen'—for they left the

that to meet that expense, its only available internal resources besides Students' fees was £1,200 a year. That would leave a residue of about £6,000 to be provided somehow. The annual Sunday collection begun in 1854 was meant to make up that sum. But the Report states that the amount realised annually by that collection was "though considerable, far short of the sum named as the annual expenditure of the University." That collection went on for about 25 years. Everything considered, I estimate from the data I have given that about £170,000 in all was contributed towards the Catholic University. Of course that was not an original capital sum bearing interest yearly, but the sum total of contributions made in the course of 25 years. The late Aubrey de Vere, who was once closely connected with the University, both as Professor and intimate friend of Dr. Newman, its first Rector, told me more than once that about £150,000 was contributed in all; and he used to invariably add "that those who were hardly likely to use it were the most generous in subscribing; that's the poor."

selection of Professors entirely to his choice, with the exception of those of the Faculty of Theology which he perferred they should select. He chose the most distinguished men available, and found that, while many were Englishmen, the Irish nation gave them all welcome. None more that he appreciated its high qualities, or more encouraged the study of its ancient literature. O'Curry's words bear testimony to his sympathy, and O'Curry's monumental work to his fostering encouragement. This is one matter in which the new University took precedence of all others. The next innovation was the publication of *Atlantis*, a magazine of literature and science which at once gave prestige to the University at home and elsewhere, and set an example for other Universities to follow. It drew many students from foreign parts. One contributor, Pierre le Page Renouf, Professor of Oriental Languages, afterwards accepted the post of Keeper of the Oriental Antiquities in the British Museum and became President of the Society of British Archæology. Another matter in which the new University made a forward step was the establishment of a thoroughly equipped scientific, physiological, and medical practical laboratory. Up to that time, and after it, not Trinity College, nor the College of Surgeons, nor any of the several schools had possessed such an appanage. They followed unquestionably, but it is right to give the prestige to the pioneer. If there be any Catholics who are dissatisfied with the work done so far—though it has raised them out of intellectual contumely into respect and honour—then one might refer to a matter which may seem more practical. In 1857, wrote Dr. Newman, "out of all the Dublin Hospitals, only three had any Catholic practitioner in them at all. . . . On the other hand, out of sixty-two medical officers altogether in the various hospitals, the Catholic portion did not

exceed the number of ten. Again, out of five Medical Schools in Dublin (exclusive of the University) three had no Catholic lecturer at all, and the other two one a-piece; so that out of 49 lecturers only two were Catholic. Putting the two lists together, we find that out of 111 medical practitioners in situations of trust and authority, 12 were Catholic and 99 were Protestant.'' Those who can now look around them, and see their Medical School occupying the foremost position in the city, with great hospitals in co-operation, should remember that without the impulse of the University there might have been no such changes, and that without such or a similar centre of intellectual energy there is sure to be decadence and loss of status. It may be asked, why did not the other Faculties succeed as well as that of Medicine? The answer is that the Medical Faculty had but to ask for recognition of its lectures from the College of Surgeons and Physicians, and these, with that enlightened and large-minded liberality which has always been the characteristic of a progressive and humane profession, immediately gave their sanction. The other Faculties had to appeal to the Governments of the time, and though they shared some of the most distinguished Professors of the period, working under a most famous Rector, their plea was rejected. It certainly must amaze men of clear thinking to observe that a diploma was at once granted to a proficient student, whose licensing involved the power of life and death, and the control of the freedom of men in certain cases, whereas if the same student had shown a similar proficiency in Philosophy, Literature, or Science, he would have been instantly refused recognition, as a danger to the State. Virtually it declared—We will grant you power over life and liberty, but not that of affixing a B.A. to your name. Can one be surprised that Archbishop Hughes of New York could not appreciate this

esoteric philosophy, for he came from a great Commonwealth which claims for man freedom, equality, and the pursuit of happiness, where also there are several Catholic Universities? Or can one wonder that he should have chosen as the text of his sermon in Dublin, the Divine words, "Woe unto you, ye lawyers, you have taken away the keys of the kingdom of knowledge yourselves; you have not entered in, and others you have hindered." In spite of all resistances, an obviously just cause and the pressure of public opinion prevailed over many barriers. In 1866 a Supplemental Charter was granted to the Queen's University enabling it to admit students other than those trained in its Colleges. As this indiscriminate opening seemed likely to injure collegiate life, the Catholic graduates of the Queen's University memorialised Earl Russell in favour of the admission of the Catholic University solely. The Senate accepted the Charter by a majority, but the Belfast graduates, a majority in convocation, rejected it, and pleaded their privileges with success. "It was understood at the time that had the Charter proved valid the Catholic University would have had a College Charter, and that an endowment would come later." But neither Charter nor endowment ever came. As far as public official recognition went, the students of the Catholic University, however brilliant or proficient they might be, were wasting their time. The only exception was in its Faculty of Medicine, due to the liberal spirit of the College of Surgeons; and it is worthy of remark that the Medical Faculty of the Catholic University, the Cecilia Street School, in spite of its poverty, worked its way into the foremost position amongst the Medical Schools of Dublin. As Mr. John Dillon, M.P., an old student of the Catholic University Medical School, observed on the occasion of Dr. Sigerson's lecture, "in the first few years of its existence the

Catholic University actually gave an impulse to the teaching of science in this city (Dublin), from which Trinity College and the other Institutions of learning are now, even at this hour, deriving advantage. I can remember myself when the chemical laboratory for the practical teaching of chemistry in this city was the laboratory in Cecilia Street, which was constructed by that great man, Prof. W. K. Sullivan, one of the greatest teachers of science who has ever taught in Ireland; and when Trinity College was obliged to set up a chemical laboratory because its students were coming down to Cecilia Street to learn chemistry."

Since the Catholic University was constituted on the model of the Catholic University of Louvain, it may be well to illustrate the aim of its founders by showing briefly what Louvain has achieved for Belgium. The old University of Louvain, which had been founded in 1425 by Pope Martin V., and which in the course of its glorious career had produced some of the most famous men of the modern world—amongst them, Erasmus, the humanist; Justus Lipsius, the polygraphist; Vesalius, the creator of the science of anatomy; Dodoens, the botanist; Riga, the physician; Mercator, the geographer; Jansenius, and many other theologians of great name, amongst them not a few Irishmen—was destroyed at the French Revolution. When the Revolution became incarnate in the person and despotism of Napoleon, and he in his turn was extinguished, Catholic Belgium demanded back its ancient University. It was partially restored under the Dutch Government, which succeeded the Revolution era in Belgium. But troubles arose from the Chair of Philosophy. Principles were propounded which the conscience of Catholic Belgium could not accept, and the storm came which had much to do with the uprising that set Belgium free. In 1834 the history of the new University begins,

restored by a Pontifical Decree—Catholic in its constitution, and in all its parts. Its Rector is appointed by the Bishops. It has about a hundred Professors, about one-fourth of whom are ecclesiastics. It has no State endowment; it is supported by an annual contribution of the people, as was the Catholic University of Ireland, and by the occasional munificence of individuals. About £20,000 a year is said to be its revenue. But, unlike our Catholic University, its Degrees are recognised by the State. The French Revolution and the Dutch domination left a legacy after them in the form of Belgian liberalism which had its own way till 1884. It chartered three Godless Universities, at Ghent, Liege, and Brussels. Against those, Louvain in its comparative poverty had to compete; and this is the testimony of the Belgian people to its efficiency. It began in 1834 with 86 students; the next year it had 261; in 1845 it had 809; in 1871 it had 1,045; in 1885, it had 1,700; in 1889, it had 1,891; it has now over 2,000. It has five Faculties, namely, Theology, Law, Medicine, Philosophy and Letters, and the Sciences. From the *Annuaire* of 1899, I find that 54 students entered for Theology the year before, 363 for Law, 403 for Medicine, 247 for Philosophy and Letters, and 256 for the Sciences. It had not complete autonomy till 1876, when the mixed Commission before which the students had to be examined for Degrees was abolished. Since then it confers its own Degrees, which are recognised by the State; and it is worthy of remark that its greatest progress dates from that time when it was unyoked from the State and left to expand freely as a Catholic University unfettered by outside officialdom. The other three Universities had a free course also, untramelled by catechisms, dogmas, or ecclesiastical superstitions of any kind; yet Louvain had been attracting so many students that the others have been modifying

their secularism in recent years. The consciences of the ultra-liberals were so troubled thereby that about a dozen years ago they had a second University established in Brussels, the *Université Nouvelle*. It did not succeed in establishing the four faculties necessary for obtaining the legal recognition which would give it power to grant its own Degrees. For 139 professors it had 154 students. To leave the liberals no ground of complaint, M. Schollaert, the Minister of Public Instruction, appointed Boards for four consecutive years to examine students presented by it for Degrees. The candidates were found to be so deficient that M. Schollaert refused to have any more to do with it, and to justify his action against the protests and charges of clericalism made by certain liberals, he made a public exposure of the imposture in the Senate. It died about six years ago—from natural causes, a Coroner's jury would say. Not to speak of those whom it has sent to other countries, the graduates of Louvain are to be found in Belgium amongst the clergy, in parliament, in the press, amongst country gentlemen, lawyers, physicians, engineers, in the military and civil service, in diplomatic and commercial life. It has sent out amongst the people men of highest culture and truest Catholic thought, who have leavened public sentiment with the principles of action which should govern a Catholic nation. And have these been leaders of obscurantism? have they damped the aspirations of the people, or paralysed their energy? The singular position of Belgium in the world of industry contains the answer. In 1884 the Catholics drove the liberals from power. Since then, if they have not held undisputed sway, they have for the most part guided the destiny of the kingdom, and its prosperity has advanced. Technical schools for boys and girls, which were very few in 1884, have greatly increased. Workingmen's Aid Societies have

sprung up with remarkable rapidity. The clergy take a leading part in this work, and have formed an Ecclesiastical Committee with representatives in different provinces for the promotion of the movement. There is also the Boerenbond, or Peasant's League, something like our Agricultural Societies here, founded by the Abbé Mellaerts some years ago. Its object is to promote the moral and material interests of agriculturists, to improve land legislation, to promote agricultural co-operation. There is the *Aumoniers du Travail*, a society of priests instituted by the bishop of Liege, who make a special study of social questions, and promote in their parishes, as circumstances demand or opportunity offers, economic and social institutions for the betterment of the people. They have established working-men's hostels in the great industrial centres. Then there are two great social organisations, both with a common object, but seeking to reach it by different ways. One is the *Federation des Cercles Catholiques*, under the leadership of M. Woeste; the other is the *Ligue Democratique Belge*, under the leadership of M. Arthur Verhaegen. The former are Conservatives; the latter call themselves Catholic democrats. They were founded by the Abbé Pottier about fifteen years ago, and have already several hundred societies and several hundred thousand members. They profess to follow the lines traced out by Leo XIII. in his famous Encyclical *De Conditione Opificum*. The light which has led to those associations came from Louvain, and I mention them as evidence of the influence which a genuine Catholic University exercises on the public and social life of Belgium.

Besides the five ordinary University Faculties, Schools of Special Studies have been established in Louvain in recent years; and to those *Ecoles Spéciales* I will limit my observations. From 1865 to 1872, the Schools of

Arts and Manufactures, of Civil Engineering, Mining, and Architecture, were established. The authorities did not think a University to be a literary and scientific museum meant only for show, or a mere factory for turning out professional men; it should be a centre whence light, inspiration, and influence should radiate into every corner of the land and over every class of the community. The sons of landed proprietors would leave the University and live amidst an agricultural population. Those who would farm their own land need a training which would enable them to use scientific knowledge in improving the soil and increasing its productiveness. To that end was established the School of Scientific Agriculture (*L'Institut Agronomique*) in 1878. It began with eight students; it has now over 200, and has a staff of eleven professors. The complete course is four years. Three are occupied with what may be called agricultural engineering, including physical, chemical, and other natural sciences, in so far as they are applicable to farming; also a course of social economy and law so far as rural legislation is concerned. In the fourth year the courses are specialised, to suit the purposes of students according to the sphere of agricultural pursuits on which each is to be engaged. There is a suitable museum attached to the Institute, and laboratory work is obligatory on the students. An important element in the course are excursions into the country, which are organised by the different professors, and conducted by them. They are more for business than for pleasure. The students must join them as part of their course, must take notes of the lectures given, which they must submit to the professors whenever they are called for during the year. A course of Moral Philosophy runs over the four years. The Institute publishes the *Revue Agronomique*, a monthly periodical of forty-eight pages. The work of

the Institute has been extended since its foundation, amongst the most notable additions being a Brewery School. There is also a School of Commercial and Consular Sciences, the object of which is to prepare students for a commercial or for a consular life. The course extends over three or four years, and includes such subjects as the following:—Commercial, Industrial, and Colonial Law; Industrial and Commercial Geography; Diplomatic and Commercial History; the principal European Languages and their Literatures; also Russian and Chinese. For many years Chinese, with other Oriental languages, had been taught; but more as a philological study. The new school of Chinese teaches students to speak the language, and thus enables them to take positions which had been held by strangers, often belonging to countries which are commercial rivals of Belgium. Besides the advantage such a school is to the nation at large, it opens up consular and commercial positions to young men.

There are two other Special Schools—the Institute of Higher Philosophy, and that of Biology and Bacteriology. The former is due to the munificence of Leo XIII; the latter is chiefly due to the late Canon Carnoy, one of the professors. When Canon Carnoy became professor in 1876, Louvain was without a laboratory for Cellular Biology. He gave up appartments in his own house for the purpose, which he furnished with apparatus at his own expense, and gathered his students around him there for microscopic experiments. In 1888 he got possession of the College de Villers for his work. This contained his laboratories of Cytology and Cellular Biology, and Prof. Denys' laboratories for experimental Pathology and Bacteriology. In 1899 a new building was opened for Bacteriology, and the old one was devoted exclusively to Canon Carnoy's work. I believe he was the first to study Cellular Biology as

a special science, so that he may be considered as the founder of that important branch of biology. The Institute comprises six distinct laboratories, besides a museum and a library—viz., for Cytology, Comparative Vegetable Histology, Microbiology, Embriology, Comparative Histology, and Biological Chemistry, each under two professors. Each is furnished with the most modern appliances; and the Canon wrote to me a short time before his death that he thought it is the only Institute in the world which has a special school for each of these subjects. In 1884, he founded a periodical, *La Cellule*, which contains, so to speak, the scientific history of the Institute.

I now pass on to the bacteriological work of M. Denys. If it were not outside my purpose, I should like to transcribe a description of how work is done in his laboratories which I read some time ago in a Belgian magazine; it reads like the folk-lore stories of the imaginary laboratories of the old alchemists. I limit myself to observing that two departments of work go on under him and his assistants. There is bacteriology, which has two sections; one for analysis, the other for experimental bacteriology. The second is the department of serum-therapeutics, which was established in Louvain immediately after the discovery of Behring. It will surprise many to hear that the work of this department is partly done in stables. As every one who has a general knowledge of bacteriology knows, if the poison containing the bacilli of certain diseases, for instance, diphtheria, blood-poisoning, or typhoid fever, be injected under conditions into the blood of certain animals, whilst these animals become "immune," the serum of their blood becomes a therapeutic agent against those respective diseases in man. Hence we get, for instance, anti-diphtheritic serum which prevents or cures diphtheria, etc. In the stables I have mentioned, twenty horses

are kept specially for the purpose of experiment, and for producing serum against the various diseases. Serum has now become a commercial commodity, and nearly all of it that is used by the medical men in Belgium is supplied from Louvain. It is worthy of note that M. Denys has a new serum of his own for the cure of consumption, which has proved, I am told, to be largely successful.

In 1882, the Belgian Bishops, at the desire of Leo XIII. established a Chair of Thomistic Philosophy in the University. Afterwards he determined to have several Chairs in connection with it, and gave 150,000 francs towards the expenses. That is the *Institut Supérieur de Philosophie.* The Bishops appointed Monsignor Mercier its President, and the Belgian Catholics who assembled in 1891 at the Congress of Malines authorised him to complete the work, and promised that they would meet the cost. The Institute has fourteen professors; and the lectures are free, and open to all. Besides Philosophy and its History, the curriculum includes Higher Mathematics and the Natural Sciences which bear upon philosophy; also Political and Social Sciences. The course combines experiment and speculation. Thus, to each branch of Philosophy the corresponding branch of experimental science is joined:—To Cosmology, Physics and Mathematics; to Psychology, the Natural Sciences; to Criteriology, Historical Science; to Moral Philosophy, the Moral Sciences, and by special application social, economic, and political science. The Institute has two Reviews:—*La Revue Neo-Scholastique,* published quarterly, and *La Revue Sociale Catholique,* published monthly. Besides its lecture halls, the Institute has a laboratory for physics, psycho-physiology, and chemistry; also a library and reading-room where over a hundred periodicals in all the European languages are taken, amongst them

eighteen English and thirteen American periodicals. Thirteen periodicals are published from the University itself; some of considerable size, and some only little brochures.

I have on purpose kept to the present work of Louvain; and I have referred only to those sciences which are the subjects characteristic of the present time. From what I have written, it will, I think, appear that although the University of Louvain is a young and poor sister, she is not a silent one. The late Provost of Trinity College expressed his concern,* lest the foundation of a Catholic University in Ireland might lower the standard of University education which Trinity College maintains in this country. If a Catholic University in Dublin followed in the footsteps of the Catholic University of Louvain, and there is no reason why, under proper conditions, it should not, it would not only lift University education above its present level, but would extend its work into fields of knowledge which are as yet uncultivated in Trinity. It is not out of place to repeat the question, what value has it given for its wealth? What has it done for Irealnd at whose cost it has been built and supported? At any rate, to inform the life of a nation is the duty corresponding to the right which a University claims to be called National.

From the foregoing review it will appear that from the days of the hedge-schools on to the present day the Catholic Church has taken the initiative in whatever has been done for the secular education of the Catholics of Ireland. But there are those who object to clerical control over Colleges and Schools. Over the purely secular element in education, bishops or priests as such have never sought any control beyond what in their civil capacity they have an inherent civil right to.

* *Contemporary Review*, April, 1899.

Control of secular education in Ireland, as far as they possess it, has been thrust upon them; first of all by the exigency of the case, but most of all, strange to say, by the action of the Government which has been specially directed ever and always towards their exclusion. That clerical control is the Nemesis. The Catholics contributed towards the maintenance of Government; but Government, whilst demanding their duties, denied their rights. That happened in education as in other phases of Catholic civil life in the country. If the bishops and priests had not thrown themselves into the task of building colleges and schools, which they did as soon as the law allowed them, how many educational Institutions for Catholics would there be in Ireland to-day? They did it because there was nobody else to do it. And it is remarkable that those, Catholics or non-Catholics, who are heard most in protest against their presence in the school are those who have never done anything for the education of the people, little even for the education of themselves. I for one should not like to see the secular education of the country under the exclusive control of the clergy. There are elements in the education of the laity which laymen should be the best to direct. But, as the foregoing review shows, the Catholics, clergy or laity, have never had, at least in modern times, such exclusive control; and for that reason they repudiate responsibility for any reproach which may be justly attached to the present condition of education in the country. But they claim, and it is for them a matter of pardonable pride, that those colleges and schools which they most control are, in spite of their disadvantages, the best. If they had devised the educational systems which we have, and had the administration of them without let or hindrance, they would indeed be responsible. But they

have not been allowed to frame systems to suit themselves, nor have they been allowed to administer those systems which have been framed for them by others. Indeed, as far as I have been able to observe, none of those systems has been framed with a view to educate us; they are mostly makeshifts which have been made in time of stress to stop our clamour by conceding something of our claims.

INDEX.

PAGE

Aborigines of Australia, Fate of, 72
Act of Union, ... 66
Agriculture:—
  In England, ... 81
  Restriction on, 155, 156
  The Burthen of Tithes on, 159, 160
Alabama, Condition of Jails in, 90
American Tract Society, ... 88
"American Letter," The, ... 289
"American Wake," ... 292
Anti-Treating League, 269, 270
Authority:—
  Reliance on not a Check to Progress, 62, 63
Aran Islands, Fishing Industry in, 223 *et seq.*

Baltimore Fishing Industry, 216 *et seq.*
Baltimore Fishery School, 220, 221
Belfast:—
  Bounty on Linens granted by Parliament, ... 241
  Cause of Advance, according to Butt, 235, 236
  Compared with Dublin as to Income Tax paid, ... 242
  Origin of, ... 233
Belgium:—
  Agriculture in, 103 *et seq.*
  Co-operative Societies in, 104, 105
  Progress of Industry, ... 107
  Railway System of, ... 102
  Religious Toleration in, 107, 110, 111
  Statistics of Population since 1884, ... 101
  Steel Industry; Belgium and United Kingdom compared, 109
  Value of its Commerce, ... 103
Berkeley, Bishop:—
  Exhortation to Catholic Clergy, 163, 164
Birth-Rate Commission in Australia, Report of, 112, 113
Bishops, Assets left by, 330, 331
Bishops' Landed Estates, Return of, 322 *et seq.*
Boer War:—
  Mr. Chamberlain and the, ... 29
  Our Share in the Cost of, ... 31
Booth, Charles:—
  Number of Unemployed in London, . 82
  Percentage of Pauperism in England, ... 90
British and Foreign Bible Society, 83
Burial Fees, 326, 327

PAGE

Carrigaholt, Co. Clare; Persecution of Catholics in, ... 21
Catholic Church:—
  In Relation to Politics or Economics, 59, 60
  Influence on Industrial Progress, 45 *et seq.*
  Points Placed to its credit by Sir Horace Plunkett, 4 *et seq.*
  Power of the Clergy little abused, ... 6
  The creator of a New Civilization after the destruction of the Roman, 49 *et seq.*
Catholicism:—
  Not Directly Concerned with Industrial Progress, ... 169
  Was it a Partial Cause of Irish Industrial Failure? ... 135
Character:—
  Analysis of the Idea of, 124, 125
  In Irish Catholics, 127 *et seq.*
  Not linked exclusively with the Industrial spirit, ... 126
Chamberlain, Mr., on National Prosperity, ... 84
Charter Schools, etc., 176, 177
Church Building in Ireland:—
  Cost not extravagant, 28 *et seq.*
  Number of Churches in Ireland compared with that in England and U.S.A., .. 24
  Protestant and Catholic ideas concerning, contrasted, ... 15
  The Motives of the Builders, 10
Church Holidays, 167, 170, 365
Commissioners of National Education:—
  Changes in Rules of, 439, 440 *et seq.*
  Concessions to Presbyterians, 442
  Dr. Cullen as Commissioner, 447, 452
  Dr. Whately and Mr. Carlile, 444, 445
  Managers no initiatory power under, .. 454
  Nature of First School Books 445, 446
  Proceedings of First Board. 438 *et seq.*
  Training Colleges, 455, 456
Colonies of Spain contrasted with those of England, 70 *et seq.*
Co-operative Movement in Ireland:—
  Statistics of Membership in Four Provinces, ... 232

PAGE

Convents:—
Civil Rights of Nuns, ... 376
Competition of Nuns with Lay Teachers, 385 *et seq.*
Report of Mr. Dale on, 382, 383, 384
Good Shepherd Convent in Limerick, ... 397
Statistics of Passes in Convent Schools, ... 382
Clarke, Allen:—
Effects of Factory System, 76 *et seq.*

Dale, Mr., Report of, 382, 385
Dancing, Cross-roads, 278, 281, 282
Dancing. St. Francis de Sales on, 279
Dancing Saloons in New York 284
De Vere, Aubrey:—
Causes of Irish Poverty, 196, 197
The Results in England of Industrialism, ... 86
Divorce:—
In America, 95, 96
In Australia, ... 114
Dobbs, Arthur:—
Short Leases, ... 161
Drink Bill, Irish, ... 30
Dufferin, Lord:—
Money Sent Home by Irish Emigrants, ... 306

Education in Ireland:—
Charter Schools, 176, 177, 430, 436
Committee of Irish Catholics (1872), ... 427
Diocesan Free Schools (1570), 425, 426
Erasmus Smith Schools, 429 *et seq.*
In the Penal Days, 422 *et seq.* 458, 459
Intermediate Act (1878) ... 464
Irish Society for Educating Native Irish through medium of their own language, 432, 433
Isaac Butt on Denominational System of, 450, 451
Kildare Street Society, 433 *et seq.*
London Hibernian Society, ... 431
Model Schools, 461 *et seq.*
Mr. Stanley's Letter to the Duke of Leinster, ... 437
Political Object of English Schemes of, 420, 421
Royal Free Schools, 428, 429
Schools of "Association for Discountenancing Vice," 430, 431
Efficiency of Convent Schools, 382 *et seq.*
Elberfield System of Poor Relief 92
Emigration:—
Goldwin Smith on, ... 304
Of Woollen Manufacturers to Germany, France and Spain, 143
"The American Letter," ... 289
Want of Work, Chief Cause of, 287
Encumbered Estates Act, ... 195
Evictions after the Famine ... 193

Factory System in England, Effects of, 76 *et seq.* 112

PAGE

Fenians Men of Character, ... 127
Financial Relations Commission, 298
"First Fruits," 324, 325
Fisheries:—
Prohibited except from boats built in England, ... 152
School of, at Baltimore, 220, 221
Flax Industry declining, ... 243

George, Henry:—
Influence of the Catholic Church on Progress, ... 52
Germany:—
Industrial Progress in the Catholic Rhineland, ... 116
Glass:—
Exportation Prohibited, ... 151
Grattan's Parliament:—
Not an Irish Parliament, ... 188
Progress of the Nation under, 189, 190, 191

Holidays, Catholic and Industrial, 365 *et seq.*
Hyndman, Mr.:—
Catholic Church in England before the Reformation, 53, 54
Monasteries and the Poor, ... 74

India, Result of English Rule in, 67
Industry:—
Agricultural, 155 *et seq.*
Causes of Decline after 1800, 192
Historical Causes of Failure of Irish, 135 *et seq.*
In Belgium, 102, 108, 109
Irish Catholic, 134 *et seq.*
Linen, in North of Ireland, 148, 149
Industrial Resources of Ireland, 290
Intemperance:—
Anti-Treating League, 269, 270
Craving for Alcohol in Irishmen and in Englishmen, ... 265
Ecclesiastical Censures on, 266 *et seq*
Ether Drinking in the North, 267
Father O'Leary of Cork, ... 268
Irishmen more susceptible to evil effects of Alcohol, ... 263
Responsibility of Priests for Public Opinion on, 264, 267, 268
Intermediate Education:—
Denominational in Principle, 465
Success of Catholic Schools, 464
Irish Gentry:—
Froude's Description of, 154, 155
The Dublin Pilot on, ... 300
Their Example, as described by Lecky, ... 178
Irish Landlord since the Revolution, The ... 291
Irish Times and Canon McInerney, 13

King's Coronation, Cost of, ... 19

Lace Industry in Youghal, ... 412
Law, Hugh, M.P.:—
Letter to *Daily Express*, ... 40

PAGE

Lecky:—
Catholicism and the Industrial Virtues, ... 167
Civilizing Influences of the Church, 50, 51
His Form of Protestantism, Simple Naturalism, ... 168
His Views on the Industrial Influence of Catholicism criticised, 167 *et seq.*
On the Religious Life, 356, 359
Lester, Charles:—
Horrors of the Collieries, ... 89
"Slaves in the English Coal Mines," ... 82
Linen Industry:—
Encouraged by Strafford, ... 145
How the Pledge was Kept, 146, 147
In Scotland, 147, 148
In the North of Ireland, 148, 149
Pledge by William III. to encourage, 133, 145
Loss of Faith Abroad, 259 *et seq.*
Lunatic Asylums:—
Remuneration of Catholic and Non-Catholic Chaplains compared, 351 *et seq.*

Macauley, Lord, On Protestant Church in Ireland, ... 321
Maynooth Resolutions, ... 315
McDonnell, Sir Antony, 341 *et seq.*
Mediæval Craft Guilds, ... 4
Merchant Industry:—
Disadvantages of Catholics, 180, 181
Success of Catholics as Merchants in the Penal Times, 183, 184, 185
Meredith, George, Views on Marriage, ... 93
Ministers' Money, 325, 326
Mitchell, John; On the Utilitarian Philosophy, 32 *et seq.*
Monasteries and the Poor, ... 74

Navigation Act of 1660, ... 135
Nenagh, Cost of Church in, ... 39
Newman, Cardinal:—
Contrasts Objects of the Church and the World, 58, 59
Number of Catholic Churches:—
In Ireland; in Great Britain; in America, ... 24
Nuns and Technical Training:—
Foxford, 406 *et seq.*
Nuns as Teachers and Nurses, 382 *et seq.*

Over Taxation of Ireland, 297 *et seq.*

Parnell, William, on Catholic Disabilities, 182, 183
Pauperism in Protestant Countries and in Catholic Compared 91
Peasant Proprietary, Effects of, 199
Penal Code, Influence of Catholicism, ... 172

PAGE

Politics:—
In Relation to Economic Work, 3
Part of the Priests in, 202 *et seq.* 210
Poor Relief, Elberfield System of, 92
Presentation Nuns in Limerick, 392
"Priest in Politics," ... 6
Priests as Promoters of Industrial Works:—
Davis, Father, 217 *et seq.*
Dooley, Father, ... 210
Farragher, Father, 225, 226
Glendon, Father, O.P., ... 228
Hurley, Father, Inchigeela, ... 227
Leader, Father, ... 217
Maguire, Father, ... 213
McCleary, Father, ... 228
McGeany, Father, Crossmaglen, 228
McKenna, Rev. Canon, Ballyshannon, ... 416
Meehan, Father, Creevelea, 228, 229
O'Donnell, Father, Rathkeale, 228
O'Hara, Father, ... 212
Priests and Emigration, 271 *et seq.*
Priests and the Co-operative Movement, 7, 208
Priests, Number of in Ireland, 316
Progress: Human not identical with Material, 61 *et seq.*
Protestant Colonization Society of Ireland, 237, 238
Protestant Churches in Ireland:
Government Grant for Building, 27
Protestant Industrial Inefficiency, Cause of, 243, 244
Protestant Tenantry Society, ... 239
Protestantism:—
A Religion of Human Manufacture, ... 65
Influence on India ... 67
On Australasia, ... 68
On America, ... 69

Religious Corporations:—
Opinion of Sir Horace Plunkett on, 354 *et seq.*
Position of, as to Public Secular Duties, ... 362
Views of Lecky on, 356, 357, 359
Revenue of Protestant Church in Ireland, ... 335
Rodgers, Professor Thorold:—
Condition of English People in Pre-Reformation Times, ... 73
Roosevelt, President, on Race Suicide, ... 113
Ruskin, John:—
Church Building, 16 *et seq.*
Russell, T. W., on Protestant Privileges, 344, 345

Saint Januarius, Liquefaction of Blood of, 253, 254
Scully, Denys, on Catholic Disabilities, 181, 182
Select Committee of House of Commons, Report of, 137 *et seq.*
Sheehan, Father, ... 198
Short Leases, Effect of, ... 162

PAGE
Sisters of Mercy in Limerick, 391, 392, 393, 401, 402
Sisters of Mercy in Sligo, 414 *et seq.*
Sisters of St. Louis at Bundoran, ... 416
Slander Against Irish Catholicism, Epidemic of, 12 *et seq.*
Smith, Goldwin, on Emigration, 304
Smuggling and the Woollen Trade, ... 150
Social Economics in Belgium, 97 *et seq.*
Spain:—
Revival of Industrial Energy in, 120, 121
Sullivan A. M.:—
Excessive Rents and Over Taxation, 304 *et seq.*
Sunday in New England, ... 288
Superstition:—
Biddy Early, ... 250
Catholic and Non-Catholic, 245 *et seq.*
Christian Science, 249, 250, 254, 255
Faith-healers, etc., 249, 250
Tipperary Witch Case, ... 248
Switzerland:—
Comparison of Protestant and Catholic Cantons, 117, 118
Divorce in, ... 119

Technical Schools:—
Founded for Proselytising Purposes in 1710, ... 176
Technical Training under Nuns, 405
Tenure, Insecurity of in Ireland destroyed energy, ... 159
"The Little Ark," ... 21
Thierry: M. Augustus, on Liberty in the Middle Ages, 50
Tithe Commutation Act, ... 314
Tithe Composition Act, 1830, 312

PAGE
Tithe War, The, 311 *et seq.*
Trinity College:—
As a Landlord, 307, 308
Medical Faculty of, ... 309
System of Low Rents and High Fines, ... 309
Tyrhwitt, Rev. Mr.:—
"The Devil in the Potteries," 89

Ulster:—
Absence of Literary Life, ... 245
Linen Industry, 148, 149
No Conception of Art, ... 276
Religion in, ... 245
Return of Illegitimate Births in, ... 272
Union: How it was Carried, 297 *et seq.*
University Education:—
Catholic University, The, 490, 492, 493
Cardinal Newman on the Prestige of Trinity College, ... 471
Louvain University, 796 *et seq.*
Queen's Colleges, 466, 467
Trinity College, 468 *et seq.*
Utilitarian Inconsistency, 18, 19

Vestry Laws, ... 25
Vivian, Sir Hussey, ... 302
Volunteers, The ... 187

Woollen Trade:—
How Destroyed, 140 *et seq.*
Lecky on Destruction of, ... 142
Report of Select Committee of House of Commons, 137 *et seq.*
Workhonses:—
Salaries of Catholic Chaplains in England, 349 *et seq.*
Salaries of Protestant Chaplains in Ireland, 346 *et seq.*

PRINTED BY CAHILL & CO., DUBLIN.

Date Due

APR 1 8 1991
OCT 1 1 2005

CAT. NO. 23 233 PRINTED IN U.S.A

BX 1505 .O7 1905
O'Riordan, Michael, 1857-
Catholicity and progress in Ir
010101 000
0 1163 0200012 4
TRENT UNIVERSITY

O'RIORDAN, M.
126286